THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, B.D., Redhill Rectory, Havant, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. X MAY, 1925 No. 59

EDITORIAL

EUCHARISTIC DOCTRINE AND RESERVATION

Probably the most difficult problem which has arisen in the course of Prayer Book Revision is that of constructing a rubric to provide for the Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament. The present position is marked by one of those ambiguities which were familiar to the Church in the days of Queen Victoria, when on a number of matters different opinions were held as to what the law of the Church really was. So to-day Evangelicals contend that Reservation is contrary to the express precepts of the Prayer Book; while Anglo-Catholics claim that there are no precepts which necessarily bear this construction, but that, on the contrary, Reservation is obligatory in all churches by canon law. We hope to publish an article on the canonical aspect of the problem in a few months' time. Meanwhile, however, it may not be amiss to say something on its doctrinal aspect. Legal ambiguity can, after all, be cleared up by new legislation; but little would be gained by so doing, if the result were, as some seem to fear, to compromise that proportion and balance of truth which is characteristic of the Church of England.

Fortunately we have not been without guidance of late from two bishops of the Northern Province, who are recognized as speaking with great authority on theological questions. In a pamphlet entitled *Eucharistic Doctrine** the Bishop of Ripon has amplified what he had written to *The Times* last summer. It is addressed to the plain man who "lives in a world which has a material and spiritual aspect," and contains a short and simple explanation of why this double relation of man's life necessitates sacraments in his religion. Those who digest what the Bishop has written will know how to answer the criticism that sacraments entail either materialism or magic. More detailed and more strictly philosophical is the treatment of

* Oxford University Press, 1924.

sacraments in the thirteenth chapter (with its appended note) of the Bishop of Manchester's *Christus Veritas*. Here we have Eucharistic doctrine brought into definite relation with a fully worked-out theological system. The symbolism of the sacrament is analyzed; the doctrine of the Real Presence is expounded as "the assertion that by means of the consecrated elements Christ is really and fully accessible to us and apprehensible by us"; and the philosophical significance of this doctrine is summed up in a term "Convaluation" which Dr. Temple has coined to take the place of Transubstantiation.

On one point the Bishop of Manchester acknowledges that he parts company with tradition, in that he pleads for the recognition of a symbolic element in the words which define the *res sacramenti*, as well as in the *sacramentum*. Granted that the elements are changed by consecration in their essential meaning and value, and that they become the Lord's Body and Blood, what do these last terms mean? He is not satisfied with Jeremy Taylor's disclaimer that he knows of no other body that Christ "had or hath" than that which was "born . . . crucified, dead, and buried." We believe that the Bishop here puts his finger on a real confusion in much Catholic theology. The simple identification of Christ's sacramental Body with His natural Body has always entailed certain serious difficulties; as, for instance, the question how He could really give His Body to the disciples at the Last Supper (or to the two at Emmaus) when He was still visibly and physically present with them; or, again, how the charge brought against Cyril of Alexandria of *anthropophagy* (or what we should call cannibalism) can be rebutted, unless some discriminations are made. And Dr. Temple proceeds to make them in a way which deserves very careful attention:

> "My body" is that part of the physical world which moves directly in response to my will, and is thus the vehicle and medium whereby I effect my purposes. In precisely this sense the Church is the body of Christ; in precisely this sense (I suggest) the Eucharistic Bread is the Body of Christ. The identity which justifies the use of one name is an identity of relation to the Spirit of Christ and to His disciples. As through the physical organism which was His Body Christ spoke the words of eternal life, so through the Church which is His Body He speaks them still. As through the physical organism which was His Body He revealed in agony and death that utter obedience of Humanity in His Person to the Father, which is the atoning sacrifice, so through the broken Bread He shows it still and enables us to become participants therein. Thus by means of Bread and Wine, blessed and given as by Himself at the climax of His Sacrifice, He offers us His human nature given in sacrifice (Body broken and Blood outpoured) to be the sustainer of our souls.

This analysis of the predicates in the Words of Institution has many corollaries. It enables us, for instance, to move with far greater freedom in the language of the New Testament, and to relate not only the uses of the term "body" as applied to the Church and to the sacrament respectively, but also the uses of the word "communion" or "fellowship" as applied both to the Eucharist and to the Holy Spirit; so that the "communion of the Body of Christ" is seen as the sacramental analogue and expression of the "communion of the Holy Ghost." It gives greater precision of meaning to that repudiation of belief in a "local" presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the Eucharist, which characterizes the Decree of the Council of Trent no less than our own Black Rubric. And, at the same time, it asserts unequivocally the reality of Christ's Presence in, or under, or with, or through, the Eucharistic species—and all these prepositions have been used by Catholic theologians—and that He is thus to be adored and to be received. We have, in other words, a doctrine of the real, objective, and sacramental presence of our Lord. By "real" we mean that Christ is as truly accessible in the Eucharist as He was in Galilee, on Calvary, or in the Upper Room; by "objective," that this presence is conditioned and mediated by objects belonging to the external order—namely, the consecrated elements; and by "sacramental" that it is not visible nor corporeal in any natural sense, but vouchsafed in a symbolic and heavenly mode.*

Now that is the doctrine which underlies Catholic belief in the Eucharist and the uses of the Blessed Sacrament which follow from it. And it is a doctrine which is asserted with singular unanimity by a whole succession of English theologians from the Reformation onwards. Even in the seventeenth century, when controversy with Rome was at its hottest, the Anglo-Catholic divines never waver in the assertion that their difference with Rome is not over the reality of Christ's Presence, nor over the change in the elements, but as to the manner in which this takes place.† They reject Transubstantiation; but with equal emphasis they reject Receptionism, and take their stand on the broad testimony of the undivided Church.

And it is necessary to understand that doctrine of the Real Presence, before the claim made to-day in the Church of England for the Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament can be discussed with any hopes of mutual accommodation between parties.

* *Cf.* the present writer's edition of the *Irenicum* of John Forbes of Aberdeen, p. 232.

† A valuable catena of passages is to be found in a paper by the present Dean of Winchester entitled *Some Points in the Teaching of the Seventeenth-Century Divines as to the Holy Eucharist.* See also his quotation from Donne in THEOLOGY, September, 1924, pp. 161*f.*

The claim itself is, of course, directly prompted by the pastoral necessity of providing for the communion of the sick and dying. Nothing could have prevented this necessity arising, so soon as the meaning and use of the Eucharist had been recovered in the English Church. We use the word "necessity" of set purpose; for the compulsion is such as belongs to the original call and urgency of the Gospel. The Church is bound to provide the means of grace to all God's people, and to ensure that, so far as possible, no inconveniences shall hinder them from receiving it in His appointed way. That such inconveniences do hinder it, unless the Sacrament be reserved, is a simple matter of experience. They affect both priest and people. In large parishes the number of those desiring communion renders separate private celebrations in each case quite impracticable; while the suggestion that a priest should communicate several times a day, and that, too, in the midst of other pressing duties, reveals an extraordinary indifference to the capacities and needs of his spiritual life. In many cases, moreover, where cottages are small, the people themselves find it far more convenient that the Blessed Sacrament should be brought to them, than that the whole service should be celebrated in the house. But, indeed, the necessity of Reservation for meeting cases of this kind is by this time scarcely a matter of controversy. That issue may be regarded as settled.

Difficulty arises, however, when we pass from this type of case to that of perpetual Reservation. In point of fact, the dividing line is exceedingly hard to delimit; for the cases we have been considering can in many parishes only be met by Reservation throughout the week. Yet the claim that this concession should be extended to smaller parishes, where it is not likely that the Reserved Sacrament will be needed for the communion of the sick on more than one or two week-days, is often regarded by Evangelicals as disingenuous. They feel that the real reason for perpetual Reservation is not being given, and that the needs of the sick are being traded upon in the interests of *cultus*.

Now it is just here that the doctrinal difference between Anglo-Catholics and Evangelicals makes itself gravely felt, and the issue is seen to be closely bound up with Eucharistic belief. Belief in the Real Presence is not simply a pious opinion which a few individuals happen to hold on the subject of the Communion Service; it is definitely the Catholic belief about the consecrated elements, and it touches instinctive chords of desire and expectation in the believer, quickening its own appropriate mental and emotional dispositions, and mediating its own proper

religious experience. And first and above all the Reserved Sacrament quickens the desire for Communion. It is an invitation first and foremost to partake. It is the most appealing kind of publication to all Christian people that the Communion of Christ's Body and Blood is there for them at need, for it embodies as nothing else can the message of God's love. We are shy folk; and many a would-be communicant shrinks from "bothering the parson" with a request for a private celebration. But if the Blessed Sacrament is reserved, he knows that he need entertain no such fears. He knows that the Lord of the feast Himself invites him to sit down as and when he can in his sickness. He knows that the priest can and will come and bring him the Bread of Life at whatever hour he is called for. He contemplates death with the comforting knowledge that the *viaticum* is ready for him before he goes. But if this purpose is to be served, then the limitation of perpetual Reservation to large parishes only becomes impossible. It will be wanted, wherever the desire for Communion is strong; and that no man can determine.

These, then, are the two main principles which underlie the practice of Reservation—on the one hand, the doctrine of the Real Presence; on the other, the belief that this Presence constitutes an invitation to Communion when the Sacrament is reserved no less than within the Eucharistic action itself. But that is not all. There is yet a third principle involved. It is that the consecrated elements, whether within or outside the Eucharistic service, are an invitation not only to Communion, but also to less intimate, though no less genuine, acts of devotion as well—to adoration and penitence, to intercession and praise. That this is so within the service a whole *corpus* of hymns unequivocally proclaims. Why, then, should it be otherwise when the consecrated elements are reserved? It is sometimes said that this is to use the Sacrament for a purpose for which it was never ordained. This is a statement which seems to us to need more attention than it has received. And we believe it to be too facile. It pre-supposes that our Lord had one, and one only, purpose in the institution of the Eucharist—namely, the imparting of grace through communion. Yet neither the particular nor the general statement here can be substantiated. The one purpose which our Lord expressly revealed as governing the institution was that of *commemoration*. That purpose is not achieved apart from communion: consecration and communion indeed are the two *foci* on which the whole rite turns. But the central purpose of the rite is to be "for a memorial." Clearly a purpose so comprehensive admits of the inclusion of

many other purposes within it, not all of them necessarily revealed at the time. One such seems actually to meet us within a few days of the institution itself, when at Emmaus Jesus was made known to the two unnamed disciples in the breaking of bread. The purpose of the rite here would seem to have been quite definitely recognition—the recognition of who He was, with the further lesson that the Eucharistic rite was to be the normal expression of His Presence for the Church of the future. The objection urged, therefore, from the purpose of the ordinance must be recast, before it will stand. We cannot narrow down that whole purpose to one of its parts. What we can do, and must do, is to ensure that none of the subsidiary purposes contained in the main purpose shall be so emphasized as to distort the proportion either of the Eucharist as a whole or of that larger life of faith and worship of which the Eucharist is the typical expression.

We do not wish to disguise the difficulties attending such a task; but it may at once be said that nothing would do so much to lighten them as the removal of the subject from the sphere of party controversy; for such controversy almost always results in accentuating the very tendencies which it seeks to prevent. We are convinced that the path of statesmanship is to leave to the clergy the fullest possible discretion in the matter of Reservation, only ensuring that everything shall be done to secure reverence in the manner of it. As Mr. D. L. Murray has said in his admirable Alcuin Club Publication,* this will involve an element of seclusion or " mysterious reserve " in the arrangements authorized; and there is no reasonable doubt that, if public opinion among Anglo-Catholics is allowed to develop freely and without constant provocation, it will steadily overtake the eccentricities, both of teaching and practice, which have in some cases brought Reservation into disrepute. There can be no question on the Anglo-Catholic side of surrendering the Reserved Sacrament, or the right of the faithful to use the Sacrament so reserved for purposes of private devotion. Whatever else may be asked in the interests of peace and charity could fairly be asked, and would, we believe, be readily conceded. We should not have reached doctrinal agreement between Evangelicals and Anglo-Catholics; but we should have recognized that, if the Church of England is to contain both, then each must be allowed to develop the devotional implications of their own principles. And it may be that through such growth in prayer new light may come to all.

* *Reservation : Its Purpose and Method.* Mowbray and Co. 1s. 6d. net.

THE ATTRIBUTES OF GOD

THE object of this paper is to consider the theology of the Divine Attributes with special reference to some pressing problems of current theological thought. Two problems which underlie most theological discussions of to-day are, respectively, the idea of revelation and the relation of ἀγάπη to the idea of God. Accordingly the subject will be considered under three heads: (1) Some general characteristics of the Attributes; (2) the Attributes in relation to the idea of revelation; (3) the place occupied by divine Love in the scheme of the Attributes.

I

Christian theism presupposes that God is the supreme Reality behind all the phenomena of sense and the source of all intuitions of the spirit, giving unity to both of these spheres and making possible the co-ordinating work of reason over all ranges of human experience. In approaching the Being who lies behind all experience we are confronted by the fact of a great diversity in the forms of experience. Consequently approach must be made along a number of different lines, rationalizing different portions of experience. These different lines of approach give us the attributes, which represent so many different aspects of the Reality we call God. These attributes face outwards towards different portions of our experience; but they have interior connections also within the Whole of which they present surface aspects. Our limited knowledge, however, can never pierce far enough to trace out their interior unity, and this fact holds us back from a completely synthetic view in our thought about God. We can gaze as through a series of windows into the interior of the sanctuary, but not simultaneously. Our experience is successive and our knowledge discursive. We have to co-ordinate as best we may. We must begin then, as it were, from the outside, and attempt to classify the knowledge which we have.

At this stage of our enquiry the Attributes may be divided provisionally into three classes. (i.) There is, in the first place, a large class of attributes which are both abstract and negative in form. They define the extent of our ignorance rather than the content of our knowledge. God is ineffable, unlimited, incomprehensible, uncreated, and so forth. He transcends time and space, sense-perception and discursive thought, succession and change, and every form of multiplicity which enters into our experience. In form these attributes are negative. But in

actual fact this piling up of negations does not leave us with a wholly negative result. Through the medium of these cumbrous words the attention is being strained towards the Object of all desire. Bloodless categories can mediate a world of mystery at the very point where the frontiers of knowledge are traced. The most metaphysical language about God has a closer connection with Christian humility than has been recognized by some modern theologians. The tradition of Christian Neo-Platonism in attempting to define in some measure the extent of our ignorance seems more wholesomely modest than the alternative of turning away from the subject altogether. At the same time the moment of negation is also the moment of revelation. The fact that we contemplate such matters at all is evidence of our kinship with transcendent Spirit. (ii.) In the second place, we make positive statements about God, which are, however, still somewhat abstract in form. Thus we are sure that God possesses in Himself all the true goods which exist in this world. He is living and rational, free and self-determining Spirit. In Him there is personality, together with all the values which that word connotes. Again, He stands in certain relations of sovereign control towards the universe which He has made. Of this class of attributes no more need be said at this point than that it is intermediary to the next group. It stands between the two ends of the whole series. (iii.) Thirdly, there are those attributes which are both positive and concrete. In this group we enter more clearly the field of analogy with human experience. Here God appears in the rôles of Sovereign and Judge, Father, Saviour, and Friend. The problem of anthropomorphism arises at this stage. Justice and love, benevolence and wrath, kindness and severity—these and their like are all highly anthropomorphic ideas, and their application to deity may easily be marred by restrictions which are "all too human." Too often and too easily it has been assumed that in dealing with moral qualities which enter deeply into human experience transference of such ideas from a human to a divine context can be effected with security in proportion to the familiarity of the ideas. It has sometimes escaped men's observation that they have been defective in their grasp upon those very ideas from which they have argued. Failure to realize this has been in part due to that very familiarity which has been the ground of confidence. We see the familiar at short ranges, and find it hard to criticize our own conventions. We have encountered this difficulty in the thought of the past. It is not so easy to remember that it is still operative. Marcion's Good God, Augustine's defective sense of justice, Calvin's conception of omnipotence are landmarks, and such landmarks are not all

on one side of the road. To vary the metaphor, the swing of the pendulum has to-day brought in a considerable trend towards Marcion, which calls for serious scrutiny.

Now in this preliminary survey there emerges a point of some importance to which we must next turn our attention. A distinction has been drawn between two kinds of attributes, one abstract and the other concrete. These correspond, respectively, to two fundamental attitudes of the human spirit towards the divine, so vividly described by Otto, but familiar in writers of all ages, in Augustine, for example, and in Pascal and in the well-known words of Kant. God guides the stars, and He also touches the heart. He is the *Ens realissimum*, and the Voice that speaks in Jesus Christ. He is to be known in His cosmic relations through the severe impersonal studies of science and philosophy; and, on the other hand, the language of religion is vivid, poetic, fervent, personal. The course of revelation has followed both of these paths. Christian theology, with its double ancestry of Hebrew imagery and Greek thought, necessarily uses both types of language, and this fact is reflected in the accepted list of the Attributes. Some of these are directly biblical. Others are philosophical rationalizations of truths expressed more poetically in Scripture. Thus the biblical counterpart of omniscience is wisdom, and omnipotence is represented by the word παντοκράτωρ, a word which conveys the idea of sovereignty rather than that of power. In such cases the rationalization introduces speculative problems which hardly seem to be present in the more direct language of religion. In any case, in the whole series of attributes there is clearly present a certain dualism between two different kinds of language, neither of which can be sacrificed to the other. It is also worth while to observe that the history of religious thought and experience seems to show cross-connections between the two types of language. On the one hand, religious mystics have shown a great liking for the abstractions of Neo-Platonism; and on the other hand theological thinkers, ancient and modern, with strong rationalizing tendencies, have expressed their beliefs by preference in the more concrete phrases which seem to stand nearest to ordinary human experience. The truth seems to be that both types of language have their roots in religion. From the beginning man has found a revelation of Majesty and Power in and behind nature; and yet everywhere religion also bears witness to a craving for intimacy and union with the gods. When Hebrew religion brought these two ideas of Majesty and Intimacy together and stated the synthesis in terms of monotheism, this represented a momentous advance. It already involved the dualism of cosmic and personal aspects in God to

which reference has been made. The Incarnation ratified this principle of a union of opposites, emphasizing as it does both the transcendence and the immanence of God. But it did more than this. It introduced the double principle in yet a new form. Christianity is the universal religion or, as the phrase goes, "the Absolute in action." It is also the religion which raises individual personality to its highest power. On the one hand, there is created a wholly new experience of intimacy between God and man; and, on the other hand, the immediate effect is so to enlarge and enrich the whole idea of God that it cries out for restatement in universal and even impersonal categories of thought which philosophy must do its best to supply. Such was the actual process of development.

From the first, then, Christian thinkers had on their hands the problem of reconciling these contrasted principles which are so amply reflected in the theological list of the Attributes. The genesis of the problem in the facts of religious experience has been indicated, because it is in that direction that we must look for a solution. But it may help us if we look first at a parallel field of experience, both by way of comparison and of contrast. The analogy in question is the familiar one taken from our experience of friendship. In human friendships there is often a very high degree of intimacy between spirit and spirit. Here is spiritual penetration which carries with it illuminating insight and confident assurance about our friend's character and his probable courses of action. But there is another side. The intimacy of friendship not only shows us clear light, but also discloses enigmas which are strange to us. However well friends may know each other, there is also much that we do not and cannot know in such a case. There is no complete interpenetration of spirits. There is a sense in which the more we know the more we are confronted with mystery, and that is partly a ground of attraction. How far does this analogy bear upon the experience of communion or intimacy with God? (*a*) On the one hand, the analogy holds good. For if finite spirits transcend one another, how much more must the Creative Spirit transcend all spirits whom He has made. There is a Christian agnosticism which is vital to faith, witness Butler, who has here the whole weight of theological tradition on his side. (*b*) But the Christian agnosticism which acknowledges mystery when confronted with ultimate Reality is an indispensable element in the most abiding and substantial kind of knowledge. In the case of friendship just cited the sense of mystery does not conflict with assured confidence of knowledge. The one is an ingredient in the other. Analogies might, in fact, be multiplied from all the higher forms of experience. Here we

find a combination of homeliness with mystery which we might expect to find reflected also in a revelation of God. (*c*) But this is not all. Leaving analogies behind, religious experience tells us that although we as finite spirits are limited by that fact in mutual knowledge, this is not the case with God. As the ground of all our experience God is less strange to us than our fellow-men. He comes as the infinite Creator to the rescue of our finite powers, and embraces our aspirations with immense condescension. The words of our Lord's great invitation "Come unto me and I will give you rest" are the words of the Creator. But they are more native to our spirits than any offer of human friendship could be. Thus it turns out that, as soon as we pass beyond words to experience, we find the apparent antithesis of contrasted Attributes dissolving into a deeper unity. "Christianity not mysterious" was a battle-cry of the Deists, and it proved itself to be a shallow saying. The divine intimacy which we desire attracts us because it comes from Beyond. "The Wholly Other" shines through all significant forms of experience and makes them what they are. Our spirits are most truly at home in a strange country. Religion is the crowning instance of this law. It is deeply present in our Lord's own teaching. Everywhere He blends contrasted ideas of God—Father and Creator, King and Lover, Saviour and Judge.

II

We must now bring the course of the argument to bear upon the special problem involved in the idea of revelation. It is the glory of Christianity that God has been revealed to us in terms of a human life, because humanity is what stands nearest to us. If there are mysteries everywhere, the mysteries of human life are closer to us than the mysteries of nature. Nature-worship means the worship of unknown gods, and stands at the opposite extreme to the Christian doctrine of revelation in terms of humanity. But if we are to escape surrender to some form of Gnosticism we cannot be satisfied with a revelation of God, unless that revelation not only gives us the highest moral and personal values but also brings those values into connection with the whole order of nature. This is simply the specifically Christian form of the doctrine that values must be shown to have a real connection with existence.* Now the revelation of God given in our Lord is a historical revelation standing at the centre of all religious history, and therefore also of history in general. Its universality is exhibited upon this

* Developed by Professor Sorley, *Moral Values and the Idea of God.* See also an article by Dean Inge in *Modern Churchman*, September, 1924.

background of the ages, through which its eternal principles are refracted both forwards and backwards for our clearer understanding. Now history belongs to man rather than to nature. Yet the sweep of history spreads itself upon nature's system, because man, the subject of history, is set within the order of nature and yet at the same time transcends that order. Thus the whole of this series—nature, man, history, and the Incarnation—is a sequence bound together by interconnecting laws. The four factors in the sequence taken together provide all the data we possess for our knowledge of God.* Revelation in its fullest sense means something which is spread over the whole of this field and through all its stages and levels. Now the Attributes of God are the various aspects of His self-revelation or direct inferences whose truth is inherent in some aspect of that revelation. Consequently, the attributes must reflect the whole of the data through which revelation has actually come. Moreover, as the different stages and levels of revelation are interconnected, so must it be with the attributes. There is here a real parallelism which it will be worth while to examine.

(i.) *The Attributes.*—(*a*) The negative attributes are direct inferences from the revealed truth that God wholly transcends the order of this world, including nature, man, and history. He is absolute, infinite, eternal, ineffable, immutable, and so on. (*b*) Next to these come those attributes which are inferred positively from the divine immanence in nature and in man; for example, that God possesses all fulness of life, mind, spirit, and personality. (*c*) Thirdly, there are attributes which summarize the relation of God to the world and His positive activity in its creation and preservation, including His control over man and over the course of history. Thus we have omnipotence, omniscience, and omnipresence. (*d*) God stands to man in a series of relations as Creator to creature, Deity to worshipper, Lawgiver to conscience, Sinless to sinful. To these correspond such attributes as majesty, holiness, righteousness, goodness. (*e*) Lastly, God is Father, Saviour, Friend. He is Love, Mercy, Pity as revealed in Jesus Christ. Now in this list there is a real sequence corresponding broadly to the factors or stages through which revelation is mediated. We move from the negative to the positive, from the abstract to the concrete, from transcendence to immanence, from the limitations of our knowledge to positive revelation; from nature to man as set in the order of nature, and then to man on the field of history, from man in the social order of history to man the individual recognizing his God through religious and moral intuitions;

* I use *Incarnation* in an inclusive sense parallel to the patristic use of *οἰκονομία*.

finally, from man and his aspirations to their fulfilment in the Incarnation.

(ii.) *Revelation and the Attributes.*—Thus we have two series which, when brought together mutually, illuminate one another. The connection suggested is something more than a convenient parallel. One evidence of this is the fact that recent tendencies in theology appear to mishandle both series, and that *in exactly the same way.* From Ritschl down to Dr. Glover and other recent writers there has been a constant tendency to isolate the revelation given in Jesus Christ from its place in the structure of history, and consequently also from its place in the order of nature. For it has connections with that order, on the one hand through the Old Testament and the further background of ancient religions out of which Judaism emerged, and on the other hand through the history of Christendom with its vast ramifications into every phase and level of human life and experience. Thus the age-long revelation of God has been rolled up into one *moment* instead of many. This was certain to prove misleading, notwithstanding the fact that the moment in question is the crown of the whole series; or, rather, because it is. For the Gospel is too tremendous to be apprehended on such a restricted stage. Now a precisely parallel tendency has appeared in recent treatment of the divine attributes. Just as revelation has been rolled up to a point in the "Jesus of history," so with the attributes. As the figure of our Lord has been isolated in history, so has the Love revealed in Him been isolated among the attributes. This tendency appears under more than one form and in different degrees. At one extreme is the point of view which sets Love and its derivatives in opposition to all the other attributes, apparently in the sense that these not only may but ought to be ignored. This is parallel to a conception of revelation which sets the New Testament in unrelieved opposition to the Old Testament. A modification of this position sets the moral attributes of God as a whole in opposition to all which cannot be included under that category. On the side of revelation this point of view allows an important place to the prophetic moralism of the Old Testament, and sets our Lord in line with that prophetic moralism. It thus admits the idea of a historical sequence of revelation, and of a divine providence presiding over that sequence. This is the Ritschlian modification of Marcion. Here history is admitted into the scheme of revelation, but nature is still excluded. Consequently we still have a series of cramping antitheses, including the opposition of biblical to non-biblical religions, of morality and piety to mysticism, of religion to metaphysics and values to existence. In this version of the Gospel Love becomes

heavily moralized and rationalized. Its mystery evaporates, and it tends towards the commonplace.

A still further modification of this tendency may be distinguished, which may be summarized as follows: The validity of distinctions between the attributes is not denied. But, on the other hand, it is argued that, since the key which interprets them all is the crowning attribute of Love, it must be possible to interpret all the others in terms of Love, and that consequently *the series can safely be merged in this its highest point.* Ideally, that is to say in an ideal world, this might be true; but actually in the world of our present experience it is certainly false. Its parallel on the side of revelation would be a point of view which allowed that the lower stages of revelation are not in opposition to the revelation given in Christ, but which asserted that, since the lower stages are all gathered up into and included in the higher, as parts in a whole, consequently they may be ignored as throwing no light on the final revelation. Thus history would not be ruled out, but it would be absorbed or taken up into the orbit of an idea. Now when this takes place it is of course possible that the idea may be expanded to include all the facts. It is, however, more probable that the facts will be crowded out by the dominance of the idea.

III

The tendencies of thought considered in the last section all converge upon one question, which is becoming a matter of pressing importance in theology. The question is this: What is the relation of God's Love to the scheme of the attributes as a whole ? This question cannot be safely answered until it is put into the widest possible context. This principle of enquiry has already been adopted in considering the parallel with revelation. Its application now requires further extension. This time let us take an analogy from the field of ethical culture. The Christian virtue of love is the greatest and, in a sense, the sum of all the virtues. Practically and educationally we keep it before ourselves and before others as the goal of all our efforts, the end of all character-formation. Yet we should not on this account deny the worth of a code of honour or of morality, however imperfect, which served as a medium through which men approximated in any degree to the Christian ideal. Examples of this would be the codes of the schoolboy, the sportsman, and the soldier; or, again, the social codes of native races in so far as they make for the decencies of life. Educationally we should insist on preserving and utilizing more rudimentary ethical forms, both for their positive good and for their pedagogic value.

Any attempt to foreclose this process, or simply to merge the lower in the higher, would involve certain disaster in one direction or another. Now here we find once more, in the sphere of human ethics and education, something which looks like a general law in the structure of the universe. As there are grades of reality in nature and in the process from nature to man, so there are varying levels of moral culture and attainment amongst men, as well as stages of revelation in religious development. In each series the lower stages are to the higher as materials for a new construction, or as matter to form, or as means to an end. Moreover, in each series the lower grades retain their character, distinctness, and identity alongside of the higher grades within the range of our present experience. Thus, there is no general merging of perspectives. Such considerations as these, indicated here only in the barest outline, suggest that man's reasoned knowledge about God will conform to the general type of structure which holds good throughout the universe as we know it. If this be the case, then we shall not be over-anxious to merge the divine attributes together, or to pass to a synthesis of all in terms of the highest in the sense criticized earlier in this paper. If God is immanent in the whole structure, then His relation to each grade of the structure requires definition as in the several attributes. This necessity of theology in no way conflicts with the truth that in God there is unity and simplicity transcending all the multiformity of our definitions.

So much for the context; but what of divine ἀγάπη in its relation to that context? When once it is recognized that all the attributes have their distinctive place in the whole content of our idea of God, the significance of Love as the crown of them all becomes greatly enhanced. Our final question may now be answered tentatively, and that along several different lines. In the first place there is clearly interconnection between all the attributes, since they are all aspects of one revelation. Now Love is at the apex of the whole. It may be regarded as spanning the whole series from point to point, in some sense embracing the whole series in its span. Thus, when we reflect upon the unity of the New Testament, considered as literature, and ask what gives it this unity, the only satisfactory answer is that the revelation of God's Love is its dominating feature; and that not as an idea which excludes other ideas, but as a ray of light which illuminates everything which it touches. The same fact may be seen in the history of Christian thought, where the experience of divine Love in Christ has always been near at hand as a solvent of hard questions. One example must suffice. It is a sufficiently striking one. St. Augustine threw a flood of light upon the doctrine of the Trinity by his exposition of that doctrine in

terms of Love. On the other hand, when we read those treatises which develop his extreme theories of predestination and irresistible grace, we feel that the latent gnosticism of the argument is due to the fact that it is no longer controlled by considerations of redeeming Love. There is yet more to be got out of this illustration. St. Augustine's theology at this point is defective concerning divine justice. But, in view of the metaphysical difficulties of the particular problem he was discussing, a conclusion adequate to divine justice was impossible unless the whole subject were raised to a level higher than that of justice. Now this shows not only interconnection between the attributes, but also interdependence. Love is the end of the whole series, and is therefore implicit in all the rest. So the lower attributes are to love as means to end, and are ultimately incorporated into Love as into something more inclusive.

This inclusiveness of divine love may also be seen in another way to which reference was made at an earlier point in the argument. We have seen that the love revealed in Christ combines in itself the two contrasted aspects of majesty and intimacy, and that this combination takes a central place both in our Lord's teaching and in religious experience. Thus the antithesis of transcendence and immanence which runs through the whole series of attributes is included within the embrace of *ἀγάπη*. In its deeper meanings Love, the most concrete of all the attributes, embodies both terms of the antithesis in the highest possible degree. Limitations of space forbid further expansion of this idea by way of illustration. Here we can only apply it to the immediate subject in hand. But if divine love is at the heart of the universe and is most intimate with man, the world's microcosm, it follows that we have here a principle of unity, partly disclosed to us as immanent in the plan of the universe and in the diverse aspects of revelation. This may well satisfy Reason in her pursuit of an ultimate synthesis. On the other hand, Love embodies the principle of transcendence, as nothing else can. This concept has actually been employed by sociology in recent times, but we can see the supreme example of the principle upon Calvary. Just as Augustine's theology was defective at the point where he failed to carry a problem of justice up to the level of divine Love, so, on the contrary, our Lord won through with the problem of human sin, because in Him the task of justice was wrought out through the medium of Love's Passion. We must say, then, that Love transcends the other attributes, because it embodies the principles of transcendence in a higher sense than is the case with them. Now it is just because of this fact that we must balance our statement of interdependence between the attributes by asserting with

equal clearness a principle of distinction. Love transcends the other attributes, and *derives its significance from what characterizes this transcendence.* That is to say, its distinctive significance is something which is not in the other attributes at all. On the other hand, the distinctive features of the other attributes are in this transcendent Love although in a transfigured form, which they do not possess on their own level. Here we see once more the general features of that structure which runs through the universe. So spirit transcends matter, and matter is organic to spirit, although in the transfigured form which we call "living matter." Thus we come back again from a principle of synthesis and unity to a complementary principle of distinction and even dissonance. For there is a dissonance between divine Love and the present world-order, which we must expect to see reflected in revelation as we apprehend it. For this revelation, though absolute, is given in history, and must therefore work out its redeeming task through all levels of this refractory world with its conflicting forms of experience.

L. S. THORNTON, C.R.

JEREMY TAYLOR AND SOME MODERN QUESTIONS

THE time is past when a great historical event could be readily described as "a rebellion of frantic Sectarists . . . anabaptized with the sanctified name of a Reformation"; nor should we expect to find, in these days, such language as the following: "I would teach my very barber and shoomaker and tailor the Preaching-trade; that so the common people should see how slight and easy a thing it is to be a Preacher, as Preachers are nowadaies; . . . The present times have preached congregations into Armies, and Churches into Garrisons; making the pulpit a Magazine or Storehouse for the War, and the Minister both the old trumpet of the Law, and the new drum of the Gospel; whose sermons are the Great Artillery, made use of not so much to beat down vice, as cities and men."

It is important, therefore, to remember, when considering the works of seventeenth-century divines, that the atmosphere in which they did their work is very different from the atmosphere of to-day.

Bishop Jeremy Taylor was born in Trinity Parish, Cambridge, on August 15, 1613. The days were troublous days, and throughout his life civil and religious disputes were rife. In some of the characteristics of his time Jeremy excels; in others he is

remarkable for his superiority over his surroundings. It might be supposed, for example, that, subjected to the inconveniences of poverty and a harassed life, he would have found the difficulties of writing, and particularly of reference to other writers, insuperable; yet his output is enormous, whether regarded from the point of view of words or of volumes, and the number and variety of his quotations is nothing short of staggering. Authorities known and unknown are quoted on almost every conceivable subject; and in such an apposite manner as to leave little doubt that the works of the writers have been well studied by him. In the first six pages of his second book on *The Rule of Conscience*, for instance, he quotes in the original from the Apostolic Constitutions: Carneades, Lactantius, and Aristotle are mentioned, and quotations given from the *Ethics*, books I. and V.—these in some number ; then Aristippus, Lucretius, Arbiter, Ulpian, Aquinas, Laurentius Valla, Homer, Suidas in his *History of Nicon*, Demosthenes, Origen, St. Jerome, St. Ambrose, Sedelius, Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Heraclitus—and the Bible, more especially the Mosaic Law.

It is not likely that any modern writer would so sprinkle his pages with quotations from such varied sources, not merely on one occasion, but more or less generally throughout a thousand odd pages. So that we may recognize the other manners of other times. Yet the remarkable thing is that he has so much to say that is both useful and illuminating for us in this age.

His poverty leads him to write as follows: " I know it is more blessed to give than to receive; and yet as I no ways repine at the Providence that forces me to receive, so neither can I envy that felicity of yours, not only that you can, but that you doe give." A man of his tenacity to principles which, at one time, brought him not only disrepute, poverty, and physical suffering, but, as it must have seemed to him, the ruin of all his hopes, might be pardoned for showing some bitterness of spirit. Yet in his " Epistle Dedicatory " to *Ductor Dubitantium*, he says: " So good a God we serve, that He hath made it our duty to be happy, and we cannot please Him unless we be infinitely pleased ourselves."

Jeremy may be classed among those Divines who, while holding to Catholic doctrine, are still extremely antagonistic to those of the Romish Communion. While he holds tenaciously to certain determined principles, he has all the time one eye, at least, upon the errors of Rome or the perversities of the extreme Protestants. The force of his arguments in a great number of cases appears to be vitiated by the very obvious necessity he feels himself to be in to refute this or that tenet

of one of the opposing parties—a necessity which at times drives him to lengths which appear to us now to be rather extreme.

For instance, in the controversy with Rome, the subject of Images was a prominent subject, and, it would appear, so clouds Jeremy's usual good judgment, that he is forced to the conclusion that no image or picture whatsoever can be allowed in any church; and even to the dictum that "God is not worshipped . . . with the productions of art and imagination."

For his first contention he obtains support from the Council of Eliberis in Spain. "Pictures must not be in Churches, lest that which is worshipped or adored be painted upon the walls"; and from Agobardus, Bishop of Lyons: "Now error is grown, and is perspicuous that they approach neer the heresy of the Anthropomorphites and worship images and put their hope in them, the cause of which error is, that faith is departed from men's hearts, and they put their confidence in what they see. But as when we see Souldiers armed, or Husbandmen plowing or mowing or gathering grapes in pictures, or the pictures of huntsmen pursuing their game, or of Fishermen throwing their nets, we do not hope to receive from them a Mullet, or a Moneths pay, handfuls of barley or clusters of grapes; So if we see winged Angels painted, Apostles preaching, Martyrs dying, we are not to expect any aid or good from the images we see, because they can neither doe good nor hurt. Therefore for the abolishing of this superstition, 'recte ab orthodoxis Patribus definitum est' . . . that pictures ought not to be in Churches lest that which is worshipped (*i.e.*, God and His Christ) be painted upon their walls."

And he further quotes from the Fourth Council at Constantinople, "another synod at Constantinople of 338 Bishops under Constantius Capronymous," Charles the Great, the Council of Mentz, and the Second Council of Sens. He then instances practices of the Roman obedience in which they erect Altars and Temples to images, "kiss them and bow their knee before them, they light up tapers and lamps to them, which is a great consumptive sacrifice," and so on; adding that "they cannot tell whether the worship be to the image or the exemplar; which is the prime and which is secondary; they cannot distinguish of 'Latria' and 'dulia' and 'hyperdulia,' nor can they skill in proper or improper worship, mediate and immediate, univocal, equivocal, and analogical, nor say how much is for this, and how much for that, or which is simple and which is allayed, which is absolute and which is reductive. And although men in the Schools, and when they have nothing to doe but to make distinctions which nobody can understand, can separate word from word, form from matter, real from notional, the shadow

from the body, a dream from a vision, the skin from the flesh, and the flesh from the bone, yet when they come to action and clothe their theoremes with a body of circumstances; he that attends the present business of devotion and desire, will not find himself able or at leisure then to distinguish curiously; and therefore it was well said of Hesselius of Lovain; Images were brought into use for the sake of the Laity, and now for their sakes they are to be removed again."

Doubtless warnings of this nature were needed in Jeremy's time; yet the conclusion that the product of art and imagination ought not to be devoted to the worship of God is so extreme a conclusion that it would certainly be rejected in these days by most thinking people. While the very argument that we do not expect a painted fisherman to give us a mullet seems to be as strong an argument as we could desire for the permitting of religious representations in Church. In this matter, then, other times, other manners is notably exemplified.

His case against the Church of Rome can be put in the following quotation: "The Church of Rome offering to prove all her Religion as it distinguishes from the other divisions of Christians, onely by some prudential motives or probable inducements, and yet requiring that all her disciples should beleeve it with Divine and infallible faith as certainly as we beleeve a mathematical demonstration, does unjustly require brick where she gives no straw, and builds a tower upon a bulrush, and confesses that her interest is stronger than her argument, and that where by direct proof she cannot prevail she by little arts would affright the understanding."

Of Sectarists his indictment is more by implication than direct; as, for instance, the rather sly pronouncement that "some think Churches not to be more sacred than other places, . . . yet it is a huge degree of folly to act this opinion, and to choose a Barn to pray in when a Church may be had."

Now to notice one or two other matters. Writing of clerical garb, he says: "It is a custome . . . that the Clergy wear blacks. And that Priest were a strange peevish or weak person who should chuse to wear grey. . . . These things tend to the good of the publick, they distinguish men, that honour may be given to whom honour belongs."

And of the vestments to be worn in Church he says: "Ministers of Religion when they officiate are by an immemorial custome vested in 'albes' or 'surplices': it was intended as an honour to the Religion."

On more important and more theological questions Jeremy has much that is interesting to say. He is very strong on the importance of immersion in Baptism. He quotes a bewildering

number of authorities during the course of his treatment of the subject. He finds that sprinkling is "a custome of the Church of England" for which there is no warrant either in Scripture or the practice of the Primitive Church. The ancient Churches, he considers, "did not in their baptismes sprinkle water with their hands, but immerged the Catechumens or infants. And therefore we find in the records of the Church, that the persons to be baptized were quite naked." St. Ambrose wrote, he says: "We are born naked and naked we enter into the waters of baptism." Of the Baptism of our Lord he says: "Behold an immersion not an aspersion." The argument is reinforced by a statement that the ancient Church "did not account it lawful to receive him into the clergy who had onely been sprinkled in his baptisme," even if the sprinkling was of necessity due to sickness.

Such a necessity he admits, for "in the case of necessity, God pardons, necessity compelling." "Therefore," he adds, "in cases of need and charity the Church of England does not want some good examples in the best times to countenance that permission, yet we are to follow her command because that command is not onely according to the meaning and intent of the word βαπτίζετε in the Commandement, but agrees with the mystery of the Sacrament itself. . . . The old man is buried and drowned in the immersion under water, and when the baptized person is lifted up from the water, it represents the resurrection of the new man to newness of life."

Furthermore, not only is total immersion, in Jeremy's view, the right and normal method of administering the Sacrament, but it must be a Trine immersion. "He that does not use trine immersion is to be deposed from his dignity," say the Canons of the Apostles. "It is impious and ungodly to immerge but once in baptism," quotes he from Zonaras on the Canon.

"That there is in dipping, and in the repetition of it more correspondence to the analogy and mystery of the Sacrament is evident; the one being a Sacrament of the death and burial of Christ, the other a confession of, and an admission to, the faith and profession of God in the most Holy Trinity." So does he sum up the argument, and state his general conclusion.

It was charged against him that he used the Sign of the Cross in Baptism, and it might be expected that he would argue his case at length. In *Ductor Dubitantium*, however, there is no more than a passing reference to it in which it is described as "a significant ceremony . . . very innocent in itself . . . and in no regard troublesome or afflictive."

Of the Blessed Sacrament of the Altar it is interesting to

note that in this work, under the heading "Sacrament," no other sacrament is mentioned. It is, to him, "The Sacrament," or "the Holy Sacrament of Christ's body and bloud." There is but little disputation upon what recent years have termed the Real Presence; but in the course of his argument on Communion in both kinds, a disputation into which he is led by the obsession against Rome of his period, and which he carries on at great length, he does give us a very valuable hint—namely, "I consider that the effect of external rituals and Ceremonials cannot be disputed Philosophically; as we inquire into the portions of effect every herb hath in an infusion."

Writing of Sacrifices in general, he mentions a theory that wine was substituted for the blood of sacrifice amongst more civilized nations of antiquity, as being more refined; and that at one time Norwegians were dispensed from consecrating the Chalice because they could very seldom get wine into their country, and "when it did come it was almost vinegar." That the Bishop or Priest should be the only minister of Consecration is, he says, an Apostolic canon or rule. "That the Lord's Supper is sacredly and with reverence to be received is taught us by the Apostles: but whether this reverence ought to be expressed by taking it 'virgine saliva,' fasting or not fasting, the Apostles left the Churches to their choice." But "It is a Catholic custome that they who receive the Holy Communion should receive it fasting. This is not a duty commanded by God: but unlesse it be necessary to eat, he that despises this custome, gives nothing but the testimony of an evil mind."

Of Holy Orders he writes that primarily it is a call from God, a "holy calling" and "divine vocation," to which a man must devote his whole time and thought. In view, however, of some discussion that has taken place as to whether it be permissible for the clergy to supplement their income by engaging during the week in some secular occupation, it is interesting to note the following remarks: "That it be no prejudice to those Ecclesiasticks, who in time of Persecution doe so attend to their Ministeries, that no material part of it be omitted, or slightly performed, and yet take from it such portions of time as are necessary for their labours, or support by any just and honest imployment. Thus S. Paul wrought in the Trade of a Tent-maker, because he would not be a burden to the Church of Corinth."

There would appear to be much wisdom in this. Some clergy may see some justification for, at least, attending to garden or allotment.

Jeremy quite evidently thinks that a Priest who sheds blood is irregular, and debarred from continuing in his office. He

regards the practice of "Auricular Confession," it would seem, as quite normal, and apparently, as outside the realm of controversy; contenting himself, apart from a passing allusion here and there, with a lament concerning "the careless and needless neglect of receiving private Confessions."

We should not, however, expect Jeremy Taylor to write confidently or hopefully on Re-union. The subject would, in his day, appear so immensely remote, the possibility so extremely unlikely. Yet it is not a little surprising, as well as heartening, to find him, when writing on *The Power of the Church*, laying down principles which agree very closely with those expressed in the Lambeth Encyclical.

"Where the Apostles did not interpose, there the Churches have their liberty. . . . Thus the Greek and Latin Churches did always differ in the Sacramental bread, the Latines consecrating in unleavened bread which the Greeks refuse." But that the Symbols were to be consecrated, that they were to be consecrated by a Bishop or Priest, and received by the faithful implies unity and necessity, authority and obedience in certain particulars. Beyond those necessities a wide diversity has always been permitted. That Baptism must be in water, and "In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost" is necessary; but whether the form be "Ego te baptizo" or "Baptizetur servus Christi" is immaterial.

Surely we have here the principle that different regions of the Church may have local and peculiar usages and customs, and a personality, so to speak, of their own, and yet be of the One Body.

Of the necessities, Jeremy holds, as we should expect, that the distinction of Bishops and Presbyters must be retained. "It is one of those great things in which present Churches have no liberty or authority to make a change . . . it is of eternal obligation, and the Churches cannot otherwise be continued." He could not have been expected to foresee the modern proposals as to re-ordination, but to a certain extent they may be said to be sanctioned in a paragraph in which he speaks of the Apostles invocating the Holy Spirit upon those who were to be ordained, but having no commandment what form to use. "Imposition of hands and prayer were the necessary and appointed ministery; for in these things the Churches did not vary, but took them from the Apostles as the appointed liturgy: but with what forms of words, and with the tradition of what instruments, is left to the choice and economy of every Church."

And he adds that it is an act of love to conform to "the customes of Christians with whom we doe not converse, who either will think you blame their custome, or despise their

persons, if you comply not." Moreover, in so doing we follow the example of many early Fathers. For "St. Ambrose when in Milan did not fast on Saturday; but when in Rome, he did." And St. Augustine wrote that "the best way is to doe as that Church does where you happen to be." "So," continues Jeremy Taylor, "as it is a custome in the Church of England to uncover the head or to bow the knee when the Name of JESUS is named: the custome is not onely innocent but pious and agreeable to the duty of every Christian. . . . But if a son of the Church of England shall come into other Protestant Churches, who use it not, he is to comply with them in the omission."

It may not be fanciful to see in some remarks of his on war a foreshadowing of the spirit of the League of Nations. "The Christian Religion," he says, "hath so commanded all the actions of men, hath so ordered the religion, so taken care that men shall be just, and doe no wrong, hath given laws so perfect, rules so excellent, threatenings so severe, promises so glorious that there can be nothing wanting to the peace and felicity of mankind, but the wills of men. If men be subjects of Christ's law, they can never go to warre with each other." And "Some will have the Law of Nations to be the measure of warre; and possibly it might be if there were a digest of them, and a compulsory to enforce them."

On two other matters of interest at the present time Jeremy has his own observations to make. The first is Music in Churches, and the second the Ministry of Women.

Of Music, he postulates that "the use of Psalmody or singing of psalms, because it can stirre up the affections, and make Religion please more faculties, is very apt for the edification of Churches. The use of Musical instruments may also adde some little advantages to singing, but they are more apt to change religion into aires and fancies, and take off some of its simplicity." How true this can be!

"All wise and sober persons doe find fault when the Psalmody which is recommended to us by the practice of Christ and His Apostles, does sensibly passe further into art than into Religion, and serves pleasure more than devotion; when it recedes from that native simplicity and gravity which serv'd the affections and holy aspirations of so many ages of the Church; when it is so conducted that it shall not be for edification, that is, when it is so made accurate and curious that none can joyn in it but Musicians"; and as he adds, "they in such a way that hearers cannot understand."

In this matter the "rulers of Churches" are to remember that "the salvation of one soul is more than all the interests in the world besides."

Indeed, and it would be well for many Priests and more organists to take these words of the good Bishop to heart.

Of the Ministry of Women he speaks in no uncertain fashion. "If women might be suffered to baptize, Christ need not have gone to St. John, but might have been baptized by His Mother; and Christ would have sent women along with the Apostles, when He gave them commission to preach and to baptize. But now our Lord hath neither commanded any such thing in His word in Scripture; for the author and law-giver of Nature knew what was agreeable and decent for their Nature."

His writings abound in wise sayings, and some humorous ones. We will select two: "Searching into little corners and measuring actions by atomes and unnatural measures, and being overrighteous, is the way not to govern, but to disorder our consciences." And "A lazy fellow told his father he lay in bed in the morning to hear labour and idleness dispute whether it were best to rise or lie still."

If we may attempt to summarize some of the characteristics of this very remarkable man, they would probably be found to be, profound learning, mixed with a large measure of shrewd common-sense, and a deep piety which informs his writings throughout. His limitations are largely those of his time, yet possibly, in a lesser degree—namely, the reflex of theological dispute arising from Reformation necessities; a verbosity to us extremely tedious; and a belief in the inspiration of Holy Scripture which necessitates the treating of every part as of equal value. Yet, as we hope to have shown, he has something to say to us in these days.

H. S. Marshall.

THE EFFECTS OF DISESTABLISHMENT IN IRELAND

The Church of Ireland, which was disestablished and disendowed in 1869, is the same Church as that which was founded by St. Patrick, and which voluntarily accepted the authority of Rome and the diocesan and provincial system at the Synods of Rathbreasil and Kells in the twelfth century. The Reformation, though there was no demand for it in Ireland, either among the Irish clans or among the English settlers, was accepted by all the Bishops except two; but the great mass of the people preferred the ministry of the "recusant" friars on the hillsides to the services in the parish churches, conducted in a language which they could not understand, and imposed on them without their consent by foreign conquerors. From that time the organization

of the ancient Church was used by the British Government as an instrument in its policy of anglicizing the Irish. During the ghastly campaigns of the Elizabethan Conquest, and the civil wars which followed, most of the cathedrals and churches were ruined. Even to-day few of the ancient churches in Ireland are still used; but the whole country is dotted with ancient graveyards, each with its ivy-covered wall or neglected heap of stones which was once a tiny church. The great bishops of the seventeenth century had almost insuperable difficulty in restoring any order or spiritual life to the distracted Church. The code of canons passed in 1634 was part of their scheme of restoration; and Canon 100 of this code states that "this Synod is the true Representative Body of the Church of Ireland." It was a National Synod, consisting of the Convocations of the four provinces sitting together.

From 1714 to 1869 the Government did not allow the Irish Convocations to meet. Even after the revival of the English Convocations in 1853, the repeated request of the Irish Archbishops for a similar revival in Ireland was refused by both Conservative and Liberal Governments. When Disestablishment came, the Irish Church had had no experience of self-government for 150 years. During that period two events of the greatest importance to the life of the Church had taken place: the Union with the Church of England in 1800, and the suppression of two archbishoprics and ten bishoprics in 1833, which was the immediate cause of the Oxford Movement. In neither instance had the Church been even consulted. It was not surprising, therefore, that the generation which had to reorganize the Church after Disestablishment was, with rare exceptions, entirely ignorant of the nature and source of ecclesiastical authority.

The British Government might have been expected to restore to the ancient Synod of the Irish Church its freedom, and to hand over to it all the property which the Church was allowed to retain after disendowment. This was not done. The Act of Disestablishment required that the body to which the property was to be transferred should be a new body, and should include laymen.

In the autumn of 1869 the Convocations of the two provinces (the other two had been suppressed in 1833) met together as a National Synod, in St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin. An unanimous resolution was passed on the motion of William Lee, Archdeacon of Dublin, stating that they were not met to make a new constitution, but to repair the breach made in one of the most ancient Churches in Christendom; and that they would welcome the co-operation of the faithful laity.

The Archdeacon moved a further resolution that the lay representatives, elected by communicants only, should form a third order in the Synod, voting separately, and should be excluded from the discussion of questions of doctrine and discipline; but he was ruled out of order. The Synod was prorogued, and has never met since.

The following February an assembly, called the General Convention, met to draw up a new constitution for the disestablished Church. This assembly consisted of the bishops, the representatives of the clergy elected according to the new rules passed by the National Synod, and twice as many representatives of the laity. The change from the National Synod, meeting as a synod in two houses, with all the ancient forms and the ancient synodical procedure, to the General Convention, with its lay representatives and its parliamentary procedure, reminds one of the change from the States-General to the National Assembly at the beginning of the French Revolution. The General Convention proceeded to adopt a "Preamble and Declaration," which is printed in the Irish Prayer Book, and which every clergyman has to accept on taking any office in the Church of Ireland. The last section of this Declaration runs as follows:

> "The Church of Ireland, deriving its authority from Christ, who is the Head over all things to the Church, doth declare that a General Synod of the Church of Ireland, consisting of the Archbishops and Bishops, and of Representatives of the Clergy and Laity, shall have chief legislative power therein, and such administrative power as may be necessary for the Church, and consistent with its Episcopal Constitution."

It will be seen that in the new constitution of the Irish Church the chief power lies in the hands of the representatives of the laity. Irish Churchmen are fond of boasting that their Church is "democratic." In reality it is almost a pure aristocracy. The members of the General Vestry of each parish, who must be resident in the parish or "accustomed" members of the congregation (but need not be communicants or even confirmed, though they are both in most cases), elect the "Select Vestry." The Select Vestry elect lay representatives, two for each clergyman, to the "Diocesan Synod"; and the Diocesan Synod elects representatives for the General Synod. Laymen are elected by laymen all through, and clergymen by clergymen. All priests and deacons licensed in the diocese sit in the Diocesan Synod. There are no assemblies for the clergy apart from the laity.

The theory of authority upon which this is based is the Whig theory of social compact. The National Synod was by local canon, as well as by Catholic custom, the true Representative

Body of the Church of Ireland. It had no right to transfer spiritual authority to the General Convention; nor, as far as I know, did it ever attempt to do so. Archdeacon Lee, in his protest of June 3, 1871, asserted that the General Synod derives its power and jurisdiction from an Act of Parliament, and therefore is not a true Synod; and Dr. C. H. Todd, Q.C., declared, in an address to the Irish Church Society on May 12, 1874, that the alterations in the constitution made by the General Convention were beyond the powers given to it by Parliament. It is then untrue that the General Synod derives its authority from Christ, in any but the general sense in which all authority, ecclesiastical or civil, is of God. The clergy and lay representatives have signed the Declaration above mentioned. If a priest breaks any of the laws of the Church (all of which derive their authority from the General Synod, for one of that assembly's first acts was to sweep away at one stroke all pre-Disestablishment canons), it is pointed out to him that he is breaking a contract which he has made with the Church of Ireland. This contract is enforced by the ecclesiastical courts, the highest of which is the Court of the General Synod, consisting of three bishops and four lawyers. The new canons of the Irish Church, as Archbishop Beresford of Armagh pointed out, differ from all other codes of canons, ancient or modern, in being almost inapplicable to the laity.

Now this theory of authority is quite different from that which is held in the rest of the Catholic Church. We are taught that the authority which our Lord gave to His Church resides in the Apostles and their successors. The Universal Episcopate is the supreme authority in the Church on earth, though of course its authority is limited in various ways; and, in each particular, national or provincial Church, the local episcopate is the source of authority. The ordinary clergyman or layman is subject to his Bishop; the Bishop to the Metropolitan and his suffragans, constituting the Provincial Synod; the Provincial Synod to the Patriarchal or National Synod, and that (in matters which concern the Universal Church) to the Œcumenical Synod. In each case the authority does not rest on compact but on Divine right. Except so far as this system is modified by the claims of the Papacy, it is common to all parts of the Catholic Church, Eastern, Latin, and Anglican.

An Irish Bishop, when he issues a command, does so, not as the representative of the Episcopate, but as the servant of the "General Synod." And the General Synod derives its authority partly from the popular will, partly from an Act of Parliament. Its procedure is strictly in accordance with its origin, and follows, as closely as possible, the procedure of the House of Commons. Its "canons" are interpreted by lawyers

according to the principles of British law, not by canonists or according to the principles of canon law. That a man who has made a promise is bound to keep it is not disputed. If an English priest had promised to obey the Ridsdale Judgment he would be bound to keep his promise. But the question would remain whether he ought to have been required to make such a promise.

The result of this constitution has been exactly what might have been expected. In financial and other temporal matters the General Synod has shown wonderful skill. It has, for instance, completely solved the problem of dilapidations. An Irish Church expert, called in to advise the English Church authorities on finance, was the occasion of a remark that the Irish Church was fifty years ahead of the Church of England in financial matters, and fifty years behind her in everything else. For the theological and liturgical work of the General Synod has not been so successful. As soon as it came into existence, it embarked on an unnecessary and premature revision of the Prayer Book. Among the less happy features of that revision are: The removal of all lessons from the Apocrypha out of the Lectionary, and of all black-letter holy-days from the Kalendar;* the removal of the obligation upon all priests and deacons to say their daily office; the insertion of a rubric in the Liturgy, encouraging those who do not intend to communicate to withdraw after the Prayer for the Church Militant; unliturgical provisions for the shortening of Mattins or Evensong, so that it is not uncommon even in cathedrals to hear Evensong sung without the *Magnificat;* the weakening of the rubric, which forbids the Communion of the unconfirmed; and the removal of the form of absolution in the Office for the Visitation of the Sick, the place of which is taken by the absolution from the Liturgy. A new revised Prayer Book, on the same lines as that proposed in England, is almost complete; but the blemishes of the former revision have not been removed.

A still more unfortunate step was the enactment of a series of "canons," the object of which was to stereotype the low standard of public worship which the disestablished Church inherited from the Hanoverian period, and which are enforced by public opinion with ultra-Roman rigidity, although Archbishop Trench described them as being of a character so petty that they could be broken with impunity. These "canons" forbid, among other things, the Eastward position, the mixed chalice, the use of wafer bread, lighted candles, vestments, and even stoles, the sign of the Cross, and the reservation of the Blessed Sacrament. The most humorous of these ineptitudes is

* The feasts of St. Patrick and the Transfiguration have been replaced as "red-letter" days.

the "canon" which forbids the use of "*incense, or any substitute therefor, or imitation thereof*"! But for the efforts of a minority of the clergy, led by Archbishop Trench, the revision of the Prayer Book might have had still more serious consequences. The alterations proposed in the Baptismal Service and in the Ordinal might have committed the Irish Church to heresy, and rendered her Orders invalid. In order to satisfy the Puritan laity, the following passage was inserted in a new Preface to the Prayer Book:

"As for the error of those who have taught that Christ has given Himself or His Body and Blood in this Sacrament, to be reserved, lifted up, carried about, or worshipped, under the veils of Bread and Wine, we have already in the Canons prohibited such acts and gestures as might be grounded on it, or lead thereto: and it is sufficiently implied in the Note at the end of the Communion Office (and we now afresh declare), that the posture of kneeling prescribed to all communicants is not appointed for any such purpose of adoration."

The system of patronage introduced after disestablishment also calls for comment. The Bishops are elected by the diocesan synods: a two-thirds majority of both orders is required for election: if the required majority cannot be obtained, the election is made by the bench of Bishops. This method appears to work admirably. The appointment of the Rector of a parish is in the hands of the Board of Nomination, which consists of the Bishop of the diocese, three representatives of the diocese, and three of the parish. The weakness of this system is its uniformity. Practically all rectors are appointed in the same way, and by the same kind of people, elderly well-to-do laymen, the most conservative element in the population. If such a system had been in force in England, neither the Evangelical Revival nor the Oxford Movement could ever have made any progress. The English Church will be very unwise if she gives up her present system of patronage, which with all its anomalies and abuses leaves room for freedom and for new movements, in favour of any uniform system for all parishes.

The elderly layman is given excessive power in another way also. Where there are no endowments the work of the Church is carried on mainly by his subscriptions. However the fact may be disguised, the man who pays the piper will inevitably call the tune; especially if he is encouraged, as he is in Ireland, to think himself competent, without any theological training, to decide theological questions. And the people who are wealthy enough to be influential in the councils of the Church have usually reached an age when the teaching to which they are accustomed has become for them the final standard of truth.

But it must be remembered that the circumstances, external and internal, of the Church of Ireland differ widely from those of every other Anglican community in the world. In most other countries the Church finds herself confronted with a great mass of loose undenominational Protestantism, more or less organized in sects, and beyond it a yet vaster mass which does not practise religion at all. In Ireland, apart from the Protestant districts in the North, and the City of Dublin, the sects are almost negligible; the unattached masses do not exist. The only pressure that is felt is the pressure of Romanism; and the question "Why am I a Churchman?" is practically equivalent to "Why am I not a Roman Catholic?" Now popular Romanism, as it appears in Ireland, is very different from the religion so skilfully propagated by the cultivated proselytizers of Farm Street and Ashley Gardens. With all its virtues—and it has many—it belongs to a civilization quite different from that of the British nations. And the Church of Ireland, whatever she may have been in the remote past, is now, with rare exceptions, emphatically the spiritual home of the descendants of the English colonists of the seventeenth century and later, and of those of the earlier settlers and of the original inhabitants who threw in their lot with them. The majority of her members regard their Church as the outward and visible sign that they belong to the British minority and not to the Nationalist majority. It is the difference in religion which enables them to resist the age-long tendency of the Irish nation to absorb all foreign settlers into itself. Therefore they value their religion, not only as a doctrinal system or as a form of worship, but as a bulwark against Irish civilization (they would say, Irish lack of civilization!). They think and speak of themselves, not as Anglicans, still less as Catholics, but as Protestants. The great division in their own country is deeply rooted in their sub-consciousness, even when their relations with their Roman Catholic neighbours are quite friendly. It is more like the difference between Moslems and Christians in the Near East, or between Europeans and natives in India, than any religious or political distinction in other Western countries. Even educated people often seem unable to realize that the conditions to which they are accustomed are not universal. An Irish "Protestant" lady would hardly believe me when I told her that the English were not all of one religion. "Surely," she said, "aren't they all Protestants?" An Irish rector, staying in a London clergy house for the first time, told me that he could not get out of his head the idea that the people whom he saw in the streets were all Roman Catholics! I believe that this is the real reason for the rigid Puritanism of most Irish Churchpeople. It is not altogether due to doctrinal zeal, or even to sheer conservatism; but to the feeling, not perhaps

wholly conscious, that the slightest increase of decency and reverence in public worship is a lessening of that difference between Protestantism and Romanism which is the bulwark of their civilization and their social habits against those of the majority of their countrymen. They will sometimes tell you that the Church of Ireland, being in the position of a garrison in a hostile country, cannot afford to risk the controversies which have distracted the Church of England. Nor must we forget the danger to which the religious minority is exposed through mixed marriages and their almost certain results.

The establishment of the Free State, however, may possibly lead to far-reaching changes. The gradual withdrawal of England from Irish affairs, in which disestablishment was one stage, is now complete. Large numbers of Churchpeople have fled to England or to the Six Counties. Many of those who remain, having been accustomed all their lives to deny that the Irish could govern themselves, find it difficult to adjust their minds to the new conditions, and are very bitter against England for having "betrayed" them, which, after all that has happened during the last few years, is not to be wondered at. But unless the present political settlement is disturbed, the younger generation, at any rate, will have to find their place in the Free State; and may perhaps begin to realize that the policy of removing themselves as far as possible from the religion of their neighbours, not on grounds of principle, but simply for the sake of being different, is neither sound politics nor true Christianity. The present Government is very anxious to revive the Irish language, and it is being taught in all the schools. The "Irish Guild of the Church," a small group of Irish Churchpeople, is endeavouring through its monthly magazine, *The Gaelic Churchman*, published at Leinster Room, 5, Leinster Street, Dublin, to promote the study of the Irish language and the Irish culture in the Irish Church. Whether the revival of a difficult language, which has ceased to be generally spoken except in remote parts of the country, will be ultimately successful, is a point on which different opinions are held. But the fact that numbers of "Protestant" children are learning a language which is full of expressions of Catholic piety, and which directs their attention to the ancient, rather than to the modern, history of their country, may possibly help to dissolve some of those stubborn prejudices which separate the ordinary Irish Churchman, not only from his fellow-countrymen, but also from an increasing number of his fellow-Churchmen in other countries.

In the Six Counties the situation is quite different. There the majority in many districts are Presbyterians, descendants of the colonists from Scotland "planted" by James I., while at the same time the Church of Ireland has more members in the

single diocese of Down (which includes Belfast) than in all the twelve other dioceses together. It seems that few Northern Churchpeople realize that their religion differs in any important respect from that of their Presbyterian neighbours; and that it is the policy of the authorities of the Church (but not necessarily of the Presbyterians) to assimilate the two denominations as much as possible, so as to form a united " Protestant " front against any possible aggression from the Free State. Hence the constant " interchange of pulpits " in Belfast, which has become so widespread as to move even the *Church of Ireland Gazette* to protest ! I have heard it suggested that the Church of Ireland might set an example to the rest of the world by producing the first example of Reunion under the Lambeth Conference scheme. But a scheme of Reunion which is based on the peculiar conditions of Northern Ireland, quite different from those of any other part of the world, can hardly be of much value; nor can a proposal inspired by fear and hatred of Romanism bring forth the fruit of love and peace. " Doth a fountain send forth at the same place sweet water and bitter ?"

The future of the Church of Ireland lies in the solution of two problems: her relation to the rest of the Anglican Communion, and her relation to the rest of the Irish people. If she continues to hanker after a past which can never return, and to cling to Early Victorian prejudices and negations, she will sink into a mere survival, blocking the progress both of the Irish nation and of the Anglican Communion. But if this happens, it is not only her own members who will be to blame. Anglo-Catholics too often ignore the Church of Ireland or despise her as hopelessly Protestant. But it is a fatal mistake to shirk the difficulties that confront the Catholic Revival in Ireland, and to leave an integral part of our Communion almost untouched by it. All schemes of progress for the whole Communion must include the Church of Ireland. Her influence on the English Church is more powerful for good or evil than many English Catholics realize. Neither Anglo-Catholicism nor Christendom can afford to neglect her. I should not be surprised if some day a great scheme for Reunion were wrecked on the rock of the bitter passions of Protestant Belfast.

On the other hand, the Irish Church and the Irish nation need the Anglo-Catholic Movement. Irish Protestantism is not going either to be absorbed into the Roman Communion or to be driven from the country. Old-fashioned Evangelicalism is dying, even in Ireland: Modernism is waiting to divide its inheritance with Christian Science and other strange cults. A reasonable and liberal Catholicism might yet, if rightly presented, win the Church that produced Palmer and Littledale and Dolling, and many others whose names are written large in the

history of the Catholic Revival. But the methods that have succeeded in England will not necessarily succeed in Ireland. It is doubtful whether any section of the Irish people shares the English taste for dignified and splendid ceremonial. In any case the Catholic Revival is still in the first, or doctrinal, stage in Ireland. Imitation of Roman methods, which is sometimes successful in England, would be worse than useless in a country where the weaknesses of popular Romanism are familiar to everybody. Probably no man who is not at least partly Irish by birth should accept work in Ireland—certainly no man who is not prepared to feel that sympathy for both sections of the Irish people which is so often wanting in England. English priests who find Irish "Protestant" refugees in their parishes should try to sympathize with their difficulties. Many of them, accustomed to a small country where everyone knows them, and to small parishes where the clergy are constantly visiting them, are very lonely in England. They have been brought up to regard the sacramental teaching and the beauty of worship, to which English Churchpeople are accustomed, as badges of an alien civilization, hostile to the Empire for which many of them have lost all that was most dear to them. They deserve the greatest care and sympathy from the Church in the land of their exile.

C. Beaufort Moss.

NOTE.

LECTURES TO CLERGY AT OXFORD.

We are asked to state that after an interval of eleven years, it has been found possible to revive the Lectures to Clergy at Oxford, and arrangements are now complete for holding them between the 13th and 18th of July.

The lectures will be given in Keble College, and are open to clergymen of the Church of England, or of Churches in communion therewith.

There will be a meeting of welcome on Monday, July 13, at 8.45 p.m. During the week, lectures will be given by the Regius Professor of Divinity, Dr. Goudge, on "The Apostolic Gospel"; the Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Dr. Watson, on "The Friars"; Dean Ireland's Professor of New Testament Exegesis, Dr. C. H. Turner, on "St. Peter in the New Testament and the Early Church"; Dr. Brightman on "The Revision of the Prayer-Book"; Rev. K. E. Kirk on "Problems of Conscience"; Rev. E. Graham on "Christian Marriage"; Rev. E. W. Grensted on "Christian Science"; and Rev. A. Guillaume, Professor of Oriental Languages in the University of Durham, on "The Servant Passages in Isaiah." There will also be two evening conferences, introduced by the Dean of Canterbury, on "Reunion," and by Dr. Lyttelton on "Religion and Social Reform."

The fee for attendance at lectures and conferences is £1. It should be sent, with the application for a ticket, to the Warden, Keble College, Oxford, who will be glad to arrange accommodation in Keble College, for those who are attending the lectures and desire it, at 10s. 6d. a day.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

Dr. Harris writes to point out two misprints in our March issue. On p. 176, for "Christian" read "Kantian," and for "Neo-Christian" read "Neo-Kantian"; and in line 11, the words "of some" should be deleted; and in line 50 for "making" read "calling." We apologize both to author and reviewer.

A correspondent writes to say that "Russellism," on which we published an article last month, has, he believes, considerably more following in this country than we had suggested in our editorial note; and that the "International Bible Students' Association" carries on a wide and active propaganda on its behalf. We hope that Dr. Maynard's article may be of service to any of our readers who come across the trail of this organization.

We have received a copy of the first number of a new Swedish theological Quarterly, started this year by members of the Theological Faculties of Uppsala and Lund, with the title of *Svensk Teologisk Kvartalskrift*. It is well got up, with clear type and ample margins, and contains over 100 pages of editorial matter, articles, and reviews. It is interesting to find the place of honour among the reviews given to a survey of three recent Anglican books—Fr. Wilfred Knox's *The Catholic Movement in the Church of England*, *Liberal Evangelicism*, and the Rev. A. E. J. Rawlinson's *Authority and Freedom*. Probably few of our readers know Swedish, but they will be surprised to discover how much can be made out by dint of patience and ingenuity. If any reader of Theology would be prepared to send us brief abstracts of this Swedish Quarterly from time to time, we should be glad to put them in touch with its editor. This is Dr. Brilioth, whose remarkable work on the Oxford Movement we hope to review at an early date.

In connection with the important articles on the Eastern Orthodox Church which the Bishop of Gibraltar is contributing to our pages, and which will be continued next month, we are glad to draw attention to the Anglican and Eastern Churches Association. This Association, of which the Bishop of London is a President, and with which over 100 Anglican Bishops are officially connected, exists to promote the *rapprochement* between the Anglican and Orthodox Churches. It works for this end by uniting its members in prayer, by arranging sermons, lectures, etc., and by spreading information about the Eastern Churches. A Magazine—*The Christian East*—is published quarterly. Those who desire particulars about this important and promising work for Reunion may obtain them from the General Secretary, 34, Richmond Road, S.W. 5.

NOTE

BERKELEY WILLIAM RANDOLPH

Theological colleges did not begin in the Church of England in the nineteenth century, but they first began to play an important part in its story in the days of Queen Victoria. Consequently their Principals

became, if they were the men for their work, very important factors in Church life, exercising an ever-increasing influence as each year a fresh batch of students was ordained. Dr. Liddon (though he was but Vice-Principal) and Dr. King at Cuddesdon, Mr. Pinder at Wells, Canon Ashwell at Chichester, Dr. Vaughan at Doncaster and then at Llandaff, each and all left their mark, and so have various of their successors. But it may be doubted whether any one of them, save Dr. Liddon and Bishop King, has left a deeper mark than Dr. Randolph, who was Principal of Ely Theological College for twenty years, from 1891 to 1911.

To look at he was not impressive. A little man, with something of a stoop, rather lame, very dark, with black hair and broad black eye-brows, at the first glance he was rather alarming. There was about him, too, the look of one who was often in pain. His face was rather markedly lined. But once the introduction was past and you began to talk to him, the first impression vanished. The whole face was transfigured, the bright dark eyes flashed with humour, and you found that you were talking with one of the most amusing and delightful men it was possible to meet. The grimness had gone; instead there was this prince of *raconteurs*, who was also the very soul of kindness.

So we knew him as Principal at the mid-day dinner in College at which he always presided, or on the occasions when we were asked to sup with him in the tiny cottage in the grounds in which he lived. His flashing wit, his irrepressible humour, his power of acting a story, his mimicry—these were unforgettable. He had been a friend and disciple of Dr. Liddon, and then the chaplain and almost a son to Bishop King, and he preserved endless stories of both of them, and stories of the generation before them, of Bishop Samuel Wilberforce and the men of that day. Then he had been at Balliol under Jowett, and his stories of Dean Stanley's sermons in Balliol chapel, and of many another, will anyone tell them now he is gone? It is to be feared that with him has passed almost the last of those who preserved the tradition. Yet there may be Ely men who did not realize the superb humour which was so great an asset to the Principal; to them he will be what he certainly was, the spiritual leader and the first-rate teacher. Both those he was. A man of God first and foremost, disciplined to an unusual degree, and spending a considerable part of each day in prayer and meditation. His addresses in chapel at Ely made an epoch in the lives of those who heard them. The little bent figure, huddled in a chair, with the mannerisms all his own, the sentences almost grunted out, the handkerchief which always dropped on the floor—there was nothing particularly impressive in all that; but the address itself was a masterpiece. Piercing, direct, utterly sincere, with its flashes of scorn and its tender sympathy, its knowledge of the human heart, the delicate humour which was never long absent—these were irresistible. The reality of the Principal's devotion to his Master seemed at times almost to irradiate the little chapel. No Ely man of his day willingly missed one of those addresses; there was nothing like them. In part you catch the fire of them in his books—like the *Threshold of the Sanctuary* (the best book ever written for a man who is thinking whether or not he has a call to be ordained), or in his *Example of the Passion*, his Holy Week addresses—but they have not quite the power of his spoken word. As a preacher he was not so successful: good he always was, and clear and earnest, and he was too clever not to be interesting, but very often his rigid method, his divisions, and the like, appeared to cramp him. But his addresses in chapel were

unfettered, and then he was wonderful. As a teacher he was inspiring beyond most men. For dogmatic theology he had a keen interest, and he was able to impart it, and he was interesting and often brilliant. He used to teach the Old Testament also, but there he was not so successful, for he was a most unwilling convert (if he ever was a convert) to the critical views, and he was apt to spend time labouring a traditionalist point which seemed unimportant or unconvincing. He was a Hebraist, and had been a pupil of Cheyne at Balliol, and he knew what he was talking about, but his point of view was one that no great teacher at Oxford or Cambridge held then.

In Church matters Randolph was very much a Tractarian. Ely had got a name for being "extreme," and in the "Crisis" of 1899 it was specially attacked. This was most unfair so far as the Principal went. He was no "spike." He taught very clearly (he may have altered his views later) that Invocation of the Saints was not a commendable practice, and he was rigid about not permitting such days as August 15 and November 2 to be observed in any way in the chapel. For the rest he taught the Faith as Dr. Liddon and Dr. King taught it, and he made it wonderfully attractive. His love for flowers and for a garden was part of him: he was a superb gardener: his anemones were a sight for sore eyes, and he had the magic touch which makes plants grow. His garden was one luxury he allowed himself, the other was his pipe—though his self-discipline in the matter of tobacco was stern. It was a surprise that he was not better known: his social gifts were so marked, he had such graceful tact, and the manners of the race of fine gentlemen of which he came, he was such rare good company, and if he had not been a priest, and a Tractarian one, he must have played a far more conspicuous part in the world. But he loathed self-advertisement, and shunned anything like display, and he would not have crossed the road nor written a post-card to advance what is called the recognition of his claims. What he taught he practised: the high ideal of priesthood learnt from Liddon and King he handed on untarnished. Hundreds of English parishes and some dioceses (though Ely bishops are chiefly to be found only in Colonial and Missionary sees) are stronger and more Christian because of that delicate but indomitable little man who gave himself so entirely to his Master's service. He had the defects of his qualities: he was a born ruler, he did not readily delegate his work, he had his likes and dislikes, he could get very angry, he was in fact most human: but he combined in his fragile person the will of a very strong man with the affectionateness of a very noble woman; he never spared himself, and he won the devoted loyalty and love of twenty generations of Ely men, who might not always see eye to eye with him, but who could not fail to see in him the marks of the Lord Jesus.

Once at an Ely Festival years ago Bishop King spoke of the Principal, and said, as only he could, "You will remember that when Dante in the *Paradiso* describes the angels who are closest to the Throne, he tells how they were the smallest angels." It was finely said and truly too, for with all his gifts and all his self-suppression the Principal could never disguise the transparent fact that his affections were set on One Person, and that he shouldered so gaily his burden of ill-health and hard work because of the Great Companion at his side.

S. L. Ollard.

RECENT LITERATURE ON THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

No one can attempt to read all the books published on the first three Gospels, with which we may associate Lives of Christ, which nowadays make little or no use of the Fourth Gospel. All that the ordinary student can profitably do is send for such books as seem from the notices in theological reviews likely to represent new movements of thought. In the present article I shall describe some recent books, warning the reader that they are those I happen to have read; more important books may well be omitted.*

1. It is a pleasure to recommend Professor Bosworth's textbook on *The Life and Teaching of Jesus*.† American books often have defects, judged from an English standpoint, which unfit them for use here. This book has quite unusual merits. It is very full, eminently scientific and in touch with the latest research without any parade of learning, clearly arranged, and well written without any unnecessary words. The position adopted is moderate Liberal. If allowance is made for this, I do not know a better book of its kind. Unfortunately the trumpet gives an uncertain sound in places. The following sentence (p. 255) seems inconsistent with the belief in Jesus as Lord and Saviour expressed elsewhere: "If the immortal spirit of Jesus is in constant touch with the life of each generation, he would certainly wish to see men make new applications of his principles, however different from his own, in order to be true to the unfolding will of God in this new thought world." The word *if* leaves the Resurrection an open question; and is there no Holy Spirit?

A few Americanisms are piquant rather than annoying. The "many" of St. Luke's prologue show the "democratic ways of the Spirit" (p. 7). The Sadducees are men of "big business" (p. 47). The priest and scribes "appoint a Committee to call Jesus to account" (p. 313).

2. *Aspects of the Way*,‡ by A. D. Martin, has the sub-title "Meditations and Studies in the Life of Jesus Christ." A quotation from p. 5 will illustrate its scope and method: "So the angels sang, and then ceased, and the shepherds heard no more. The glory contracted, narrowed into a stream of silver that passed along those hills, and faded into the light of splendid stars, and all the earth was dark and still, except for the leaping fire of the bivouac and the tinkle of a sheep-bell." Such deliberately fine writing, reminiscent of Walter Pater and, on a different level, of Dean Farrar, has gone out of fashion. After all, in spite of its beauty, it adds nothing to our comprehension of the Bible story. I think the desire to be picturesque sometimes leads Mr. Martin to be inaccurate. But, having said this, I have nothing left but praise for his book, which is marked by rare spiritual insight. On nearly every page one meets an illumination of familiar facts from an unusual angle. The preacher will get many sermons from this modest little study, though its aim, successfully accomplished, is the edification of the general reader.

3. Dr. Cadman's essay on *The Last Journey of Jesus*§ is very important. The author is tutor of New Testament Greek at Mansfield College, Oxford,

* Books of which the publisher and price are given have been sent to this journal for review. The most important of all, Canon Streeter's *The Four Gospels*, is not discussed, as a full review by Professor Turner has already appeared.

† The Macmillan Company, 1924. 10s. 6d.

‡ Cambridge University Press, 1924. 6s.

§ Oxford Press, 1923. 7s. 6d.

and a Doctor of Strasbourg University. With extraordinary economy of words and lucidity of style he sketches a theory which, if not wholly original, has never been presented before in quite this way. On the basis of the documents, critically reconstructed, he traces the development of our Lord's mind and purpose. As I shall confine myself to an exposition of his views, I content myself with saying in advance that, in my opinion, these reconstructions are impossible. We cannot, with the evidence at our disposal, recover the original order of the Gospel *pericopes*,* and the "psychologizing"† of the Saviour's life is a task beyond our powers.

According to Dr. Cadman, Jesus, proclaiming repentance as the preparation for the Kingdom, came into conflict with the religious leaders over the authority of the Torah. These combined with Herod Antipas, who was afraid of a popular eschatological movement, to make Him leave Galilee. With Mark vi. the Galilean ministry ends.‡ In Luke xiii. 31-33, which belongs to this period, Jesus is given the choice by "that fox" of relinquishing His ministry or death. Perhaps verse 32 originally meant "I will leave Galilee on the third day." John vi. 15—the crowd wants to make Jesus King—may well be a genuine tradition. But there was no falling away of Galilean adherents.

Jesus acquiesced in banishment from Galilee, for He meant to preach at Jerusalem, knowing that this would entail death. The Galilean crisis would be repeated in an acuter form. He came to realize that He was a heavenly being, the Son of Man, and that the Kingdom would come after and through His death. He had given up the idea of the Davidic Messiah, if He had ever held it, and the command of silence after Peter's confession (Mark viii. 30) was intended to prevent His dying on a false issue. The disciples were told that His cause involved their martyrdom too. There is no Messianic entry in Mark, and John xii. 16 specifically states that the significance of the entry was not seen at the time. The Bartimæus story does not contradict this view, the cry "Son of David" being casual and not taken seriously.

The cleansing of the temple was a bid for popular support in order to gain time for His preaching. The angry authorities sought in vain for an accusation which would at once disarm the people and be sufficient to induce the Roman procurator to inflict the death penalty. Then Judas betrayed the secret, hitherto withheld from all except the inner circle, that Jesus claimed to be the Messiah. The Agony was caused by the realization that He would die on a false issue, that Jerusalem, instead of repenting, would condemn Him as a false prophet. "In the darkness of this defeat He bound the loyal disciples to Himself at the Last Supper, guaranteeing them reunion after a while; for though few of His own generation would possess it, the Kingdom would come. Here is an expectation which the course of history has left unfulfilled; but this only means that our God and Father, in His ordering of the world, kindled and sustained in the Prophet of Nazareth an enthusiasm and an utter devotion the ultimate purpose of which He Himself discerned only in part."

With this the book ends. A little before Dr. Cadman explains the purpose of the Last Supper as being to make a covenant with the disciples

* See Schmidt's book, described below.

† Against which Schweitzer protested so vigorously.

‡ vii. 1 to viii. 26 is generally recognized as a supplemental section, perhaps duplicating foregoing incidents.

through a sacramental rite. "His mind was moving somewhere within that circle of ideas which underlies the mystery religions, and primitive religion in some of its forms, and according to which, by jointly partaking of sacred food, the god and the worshippers were knit to one another. That our Lord entertained this conception in a form free from gross materialism is not at all improbable. . . . The syncretism between the Eucharist and the ritual feasts of the mystery-cults is more satisfactorily accounted for when it is allowed that from the beginning the sacramental idea was not absent from the Christian rite."*

4. Mr. Lockton has written two essays which are found in a book entitled *The Resurrection and the Virgin Birth.*† The second essay need not detain us. The first studies the Resurrection narratives with the help of the theory that Luke is the earliest Gospel, Mark is secondary to Luke, and Matthew combines Luke and Mark. "The Mark-Q hypothesis . . . is really only a mare's nest." Mr. Lockton considers that his own hypothesis is "proved beyond reasonable doubt" (p. 118). A very thorough book would be needed to induce scholars to take this position seriously. The arguments used in the present work are not strong. Luke's version of the Transfiguration is said to be original, and Mark's secondary because he does not mention the subject of the conversation between our Lord and the heavenly visitors (p. 67). Mark xv. 40, 41 (mentioning Mary Magdalene, Mary the Mother of James and Joses, and Salome) is based upon the corresponding passage of Luke, Luke viii. 1-3 (mentioning Mary Magdalene, Joanna, and Susanna) and xix. 28. "Clearly we have a conflation of several passages of Luke" (p. 10). The idea seems to be that because difficulties are smoothed away in Luke's version, therefore it is the earliest. Mark's story of the tomb is an interpretation of Luke in the light of Gen. xxix. 1-3, 8 (the stone over the well). It and Matthew are "interpretative developments" or "legendary accretions" (p. 37). Mark mistook a subjective vision of angels as objective. This "is proof that his narrative is of a secondary character" (p. 90). While we think Mr. Lockton's main thesis is perverse, there is much interesting writing in his essay.

5. Hilarin Felder's huge book, *Christ and the Critics*,‡ possesses considerable interest as a thesaurus of passages, good, bad, and indifferent, and we agree with the author in his dislike of pseudo-criticism which assumes its conclusions and leaves us with a Jesus whose death would not have caused a ripple on the water. But we cannot think the book much help to its cause. The author writes in a white heat of passion against "the critics," "our enemies," forgetting that man's wrath does not work God's righteousness. All is grist that comes to his mill. German rationalists whose works have only an archæological interest, scholars like Schweitzer, whose missionary career should be enough to secure him from abuse, fugitive utterances at Congresses of Religion, obscure novels reflecting French or German bad taste—all alike form the enemy. Nearly everything they say is contradicted by someone in the motley band, which proves criticism to be inconsistent. Views which do not deserve mention, such as a theory that St. Joseph suffered from chronic alcoholism, are

* It has recently been argued in the columns of THEOLOGY as a kind of *reductio ad absurdum* that those who see in the sacramentalism of the Church a concession to "mystery" ideas are logically bound to find the concession in Jesus Himself. The passage quoted above shows that some scholars do not shrink from the challenge.

† Longmans, 1924. 5s.

‡ Burns Oates and Washbourne, vol. ii., 1924. 12s. 6d.

exposed to ridicule. The writer seems unaware that there is a historical problem, and that the Gospel traditions are sometimes inconsistent. A miracle for him "stands outside the order of nature." The sun literally halted at Joshua's command. On p. 29 we read that "brethren" means "cousins" according to universal Hebrew usage. On p. 67 an "unfathomable divine peace, unclouded by a single passion," is ascribed to our Lord. Surely a study of St. Mark makes this presentment impossible. On p. 82 a very misleading sentence occurs: "The latest attempt to derive the Lord's Prayer from Jewish sources has proved unsuccessful." A leading Anglican weekly said of the first volume that "it is the most detailed and effective reply that we have yet read to the arguments of the Higher Critics about the Gospels."

6. Lest I should seem unsympathetic to Roman Catholic books I take Lagrange's *Évangile selon Saint Luc** next, and welcome it as the most complete and scholarly on the Conservative side in any language. The learned father is handicapped by the findings of the Biblical Commission, and is obliged to retract his previously expressed views on the Synoptic Gospels. Their order is (1) Matthew, (2) Mark, (3) Luke. Matthew did not compose the Logia, but put them in order. It is sufficient to hold that Matthew's Hebrew Gospel is earliest and the Greek translation later. Luke follows Mark in preference to Matthew.

The non-Roman wonders at these expedients. But the Commentary, as a whole, is a magnificent example of critical method, in no way handicapped by the Biblical Commission. Lagrange argues with great force for 63–64 as the date, but says very sensibly that it is a matter of indifference if Luke wrote c. 80, provided he made his investigations earlier. We note the following interesting statements. No one doubts that Luke edited the *Magnificat*. Luke neglected topography and chronology in the last visit to Jerusalem. In his account of the Baptism he omits the confession of sins by the crowd in order to avoid the question: How far did that apply to Jesus? He makes Mark ii. 13 and iv. 1 into one incident.

Commenting on Luke iv. 30 Lagrange says the passing through of Jesus was natural. "Nos revolutions" provide similar instances of reversals of popular favour. Loisy's explanation of Martha and Mary—the two sisters symbolizing Jewish and Hellenistic sections of the Church—is neatly countered by the ironic theory that they really stand for the deacons and apostles of Acts vi. 2.

We like the commentary all the better for occasional remarks such as this on ix. 58—"the Son of Man hath not where to lay his head" (*ποῦ τὴν κεφάλην κλίνῃ*). "It is touching to think that Jesus has at last laid his head—on the Cross (*κλίνας τὴν κεφάλην* John xix. 30)."

7. Professor Turner has begun a series of articles in the *Journal of Theological Studies* on St. Mark. The July number (1924) deals with "impersonal plurals," a third person plural used in the sense of the French "on dit." He finds many convincing examples. One of these is most helpful. In iii. 21 the friends of Jesus (*οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ*) "went out to lay hold of him: for they said (on dit), He is beside himself" (*ἔλεγον γὰρ ὅτι ἐξέστη*). In verse 31 "his mother and his brethren" arrive. There is no reason to think the Virgin Mary formed an unfavourable conclusion. On hearing the report that He was beside Himself (*people* said so), she naturally went to learn the truth. The hiatus of verses 22-30 is caused

* Paris, 1921.

by St. Mark's being reminded of "the other and more evil-minded, but more logical theory of people from Jerusalem" that He was possessed by Beelzebub, "and being reminded of it he deals with it first."

8. A charming little contribution has been made by Schütz in his study of the arrangement of clauses in the New Testament writers (*Der parallele Bau der Satzglieder im N.T.**). St. Mark is one of the books studied. His position is that Greek writers in the first century would as a rule aim at artistically rhythmic prose. Naturally a writer of Jewish antecedents would also be affected by the stately prose, for example that of Proverbs, found in the Old Testament. In St. Mark a great many passages can be resolved into κῶλα, clauses and sentences corresponding to one another according to definite rules. A neat example is provided by ii. 21, 22.

I. (*a*) No man seweth a piece of undressed cloth on an old garment:
(*b*) otherwise (εἰ δὲ μή)
(*c*) that which should fill it up taketh from it [the new from the old],
(*d*) and a worse rent is made.
II. (*a*) And no man putteth new wine into old wine-skins:
(*b*) otherwise (εἰ δὲ μή)
(*c*) the wine will burst the skins,
(*d*) and the wine perisheth and the skins.

(*a*) is the thesis, (*b*) the hypothesis, (*c*) the consequence, (*d*) the consequence repeated in a heightened form. The bracketed clause is clearly a gloss. In R.V. we have II. (*e*) "but they put new wine into fresh wine-skins." Codex Bezae and the Old Latin omit the clause rightly. Can we believe that the original had the unbalanced fifth clause, and that the above perfectly rhythmical result was reached by accidental omission of a clause?

9. The "Paulinism" of Mark has been confidently asserted by many writers. M. Werner, in *Der Einfluss paulinischer Theologie im Markusevangelium*,† contributes an exhaustive study of every passage in the Second Gospel that could possibly be traced to Pauline influence. Seldom has a special investigation so completely settled a disputed point. The result is as follows: Where Mark agrees with Paul, both are using the common stock of Church ideas. Ideas not traceable to this common stock and characteristically Pauline are not represented in Mark, who occupies a quite different standpoint. There is, therefore, no Paulinism in Mark, in whom we find the earlier stage, of which Paulinism is a development. This is eminently satisfactory. Unfortunately the writer goes further and maintains irreconcilable contradictions between Mark and Paul. In Mark Jesus and His disciples are already free from the law: in Paul His death frees from the law. In the Gospel the Jews accepted Jesus, only their leaders rejecting Him: in the Apostle the Jews as a body rejected Him. In the Gospel the law can be kept: in St. Paul it cannot. We have only to think of parallel cases in our own day to realize how wrong this method of arguing is. Take the speeches of two political leaders, isolate them from the common background of education, social life, and enlightened patriotism, develop each position to its logical conclusion without regard to counterbalancing factors, and you can plausibly argue that the two men are irreconcilable foes. In practice they get on very well in Parliament, agree with each other on practically all foreign questions, and can work

* Göttingen, 1920. † Giessen, 1923.

together on most matters of domestic politics. So in the Apostolic Age. Legitimate differences of outlook did not prevent the leaders from being one in all essentials.

10. The reader at first stands aghast before the colossal commentary on St. Matthew by Strack and Billerbeck, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus erläutert aus Midrash und Talmud.** (Over 1,000 pages of 700 or so words are devoted to explaining and illustrating one New Testament book from Rabbinic sources only.) Then, praying for *robur et æs triplex*, he ventures out on a voyage of discovery. The treasure he brings home is very great. In truth, this is a marvellous book. Everything that the Rabbis said on every New Testament subject is here given in a German translation. Wherever necessary, the Hebrew and Aramaic are added. So are the approximate dates of the Rabbis who speak. The only adverse criticism that can fairly be made is the overwhelming mass of material. When Jordan is mentioned, it does not really help us to be told what all the Rabbis said in praise of that river. But the book is indispensable. No one can be accounted properly equipped as a commentator on the New Testament unless he is accustomed to move freely in this field of Jewish thought and custom now made accessible to all.

A few of the comments and illustrations may be given here. On iii. 6 we have an intensely interesting account of proselyte-baptism. In the first century A.D. the schools of Shammai and Hillel argued about it, assuming it as a self-evident custom. Clearly its roots lie in the previous century. The baptism of proselytes and that of Jews who had become unclean were essentially the same rite. Shammai allowed baptism to follow immediately upon circumcision; Hillel insisted on an interval of seven days. What was the relation between circumcision and baptism? The existence of extra-Jewish circumcision raised a problem, but that was not counted valid. Seemingly the importance of women proselytes caused baptism to gain in public estimation at the expense of circumcision, which applied to one sex only.

On iv. 9 we read that the Jews assigned various countries to individual angels. The Roman Empire was the special property of Satan. There is only one doubtful passage in the whole of the Rabbinic literature where a fisherman occurs. "The poor in spirit" of verse 3 are "the people of the land," those who have no merits of their own of which to boast, and therefore trust entirely to God.

New light is thrown on the early Christian view of marriage by the observation that "adultery" applies only to Jews. Misconduct on the part of a Jewish husband with a Gentile woman was called "fornication" not "adultery." Christians, inheriting these ideas, would differentiate sharply between Christian and non-Christian marriage. The writers leave it an open question, but are inclined to think that the *lex talionis* ("an eye for an eye," etc.) was literally observed in our Lord's day. Capernaum is described in ix. 1 as our Lord's "own city." A year's residence was necessary before one became a member of a new civic community.

Matt. xvi. 18 is translated back into Aramaic, in which it reads: "I say | to *thee* | , Peter | , upon this rock," etc. ('Amar | lāk 'att | Petrōṣ . . .). By a common Aramaic idiom "thou" in the nominative is repeated after "thee" of "to thee" for emphasis. The familiar "thou

* München, 1922. The second volume, dealing with Mark, Luke, John and Acts, was published in 1924. It adds little to our knowledge of the Synoptic Gospels, on which nearly all necessary to be said was said in the first volume.

art Peter " disappears entirely. This is plausible, since in any case there would be no word for " art " in the Aramaic.

The originality of Jesus is strongly upheld by these Rabbinic experts. Time after time we are shown that He said something in terse, unforgettable phrase which the Rabbis, independently, expanded to a long utterance with the point blunted. He was the only Jewish teacher to proclaim a non-Pharisaic righteousness. To take a few out of many examples: There is no Rabbinic parallel to the Kingdom of Heaven acting as leaven; no Rabbinic idea that seeing God depended on purity of heart—rather, the Rabbis said, on good works and knowledge of Torah. The conception of general humanity, of man as such being one's " neighbour," appears first, outside the Gospels, in Rabbis of the second century A.D.

11. K. L. Schmidt's book on the framework of the Synoptic tradition (*Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu**) has attracted little or no notice in England, in spite of its originality. His special subject, which is discussed in great detail, is the connecting links between the different sections of the Gospels. The main body of Mark, for example, is held to be a collection of short liturgical *pericopes*, themselves of great historical value, connected by chronological and geographical links which are seldom historical. We can trace the remains of an Itinerary of Jesus in the framework, but that is all. No reliance can be placed on Mark's scheme, which is as arbitrary in its one-year as John's in its three-year theory. For example, the Cleansing of the Temple is timeless. All the primitive tradition knew was that Jesus protested vigorously against the abuses of the sanctuary when He saw them. Mark, bound by his theory of a one-year ministry, is obliged to date the Cleansing in the final visit to Jerusalem; John, not so bound, as naturally puts it in the first visit. Many indications point to a far longer ministry than is allowed by Mark's scheme: the preaching to Chorazin, incidentally alluded to in Matt. ix. 21, Peter's answer in Matt. xvii. 25 that his Master was accustomed to pay the Temple tax, the many adherents in Jerusalem presupposed by the Markan Passion-narrative, etc.†

Considerable space would be required in order to do justice to Schmidt's destructive criticism of the Marcan framework. It is very convincing. Three general considerations may, however, be put forward: (*a*) Matthew and Luke allow themselves the utmost freedom in altering the order and even locality of sections which are otherwise retained faithfully. Clearly they attached no importance to this side of Mark's work. (*b*) Papias, in

* Berlin, 1919.

† The chronology of our Lord's life is far from fixed. (i.) C. H. Turner shows that five lines of converging evidence bring up to A.D. 29 for the Crucifixion: Meyer (*Ursprung und Anfänge*, iii. 171) says 27 is the latest possible date. (ii.) A census in Egypt is attested for A.D. 19 to 20, and these censuses took place every fourteen years. We can therefore argue back with plausibility to earlier censuses in A.D. 5 to 6 and B.C. 10 to 9 (Mitteis-Wilcken). The last date would make room for a much longer ministry than is usually assumed. (iii.) " About thirty years " in Luke iii. 23 would cover any age from twenty-eight to thirty-two (Turner). (iv.) Loisy's exegesis of John ii. 20, viii. 57 cannot be disregarded. " Forty-six years was this temple in building "—the Evangelist explains of the temple of His body, that is, Jesus was forty-six at the first passover. Three years later at the end of the Ministry He was not yet fifty, that is forty-nine, years old. At the Resurrection He completed seven by seven years (mystically) and entered upon the jubilee. (v.) Irenæus (II., xxii. 3-6) distinctly says that the elders had a tradition of a long ministry.

I do not seriously propose that we should take the earliest possible date for the Birth, the earliest for the Baptism, and the latest for the Crucifixion, but I want to keep the door open for a ministry of three or even more years.

words that are persistently neglected, tells us that Mark wrote down his reminiscences of Peter's teaching "not however in order." (*c*) Augustine (*de Cons. Evan.* ii. 21 *f*) says that the Evangelists wrote in the order in which God recalled the several narratives to them. Thus we need not suppose that the evening "when the sun did set" of Mark i. 32 was the same evening in which Jesus healed Peter's mother-in-law (v. 31). This is precisely the manner in which Schmidt treats the Markan notes of time.

If Mark's framework is worthless historically, as artificial as John's, his Gospel remains the earliest and best. Matthew, as is obvious, grouped his material for liturgical convenience. Luke, who claims to write "in order" (i. 3), is plainly even further removed from the original course of events than Mark. Some deduction must be made for the rhetorical nature of his preface, but he apparently aims at a psychological rather than historical order, except in ix.-xviii. where he shows traces of becoming tired of the effort.

Some of Schmidt's work is marred by excessive scepticism. In places, so he owns, Mark tells a story in the very words of Peter. It is only reasonable to suppose that the Apostle remembered the order of events to some extent. But in the main his book is helpful and convincing. On p. 19 he draws a most attractive picture of Gospel origins. The disciples are gathered for worship and edification. The Old Testament is read as a holy book. Confessing Jesus as Messiah and Lord, they feel the need of rehearsing His acts and words. One relates a tale, and when he finishes a second begins with "And it came to pass that . . ." The separate tales are told time after time till they become stereotyped; each begins with "and." Finally, the Evangelist Mark strings together the detached tales, providing a literary framework as best he can.

The Passion Narrative is on a different footing. When the Passover came round the whole story had to be told. A *continua lectio* was formed, such as would answer the question, How came the Messiah to be treated so by His own people?

Schmidt finds the two-source hypothesis (Mark and Q) too rigid. The tales continued to be told long after the earliest Gospel was written. It would not be accurate to say that he rehabilitates John; but by depreciating the notes of time and place in Mark he shows that those in John have as good a chance of being true.

12. Bultmann's *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition** uses a method similar to Schmidt's to investigate separately the history of *groups* of material; sayings, for example, may have a quite different history from miracle-stories. He starts from the undoubted fact that as Matthew-Luke altered Mark and Q, so these had in their time altered the previous tradition.

There is a class of sections which we may call Apophthegmata, where the words are central and the framework secondary. Thus, in Mark ii. 3-12, 5 *b*-10 is a later insertion, as is shown by the repetition of the words "he saith to the sick of the palsy," at which the cut was made. It was built up round the logion "The Son of Man hath authority on earth to forgive sins," which it was thought well to introduce here. In Mark ii. 23-28, 27 and 28 form an originally isolated logion. The rest of the section is of literary origin, dating from the period of Jewish-Christian controversies in the early Church. The disciples† are accused of a wrong attitude

* Göttingen, 1921.

† Not Jesus. Had the incident been historical Jesus would have been accused.

towards the Sabbath. They justify themselves by a saying of their Master attached to an authentic logion.

In another group of passages the answer is central, the question and connecting links being secondary. The best authenticated words of Jesus are those in which He speaks like a Jewish wise man in the style of Proverbs.

We may dispute about the more or less, but the general tendency of tradition cannot be denied; it adds, modifies, and combines freely. We can place no confidence even in Q. The Church has picked up popular sayings and ascribed them to Jesus. Some, such as that of the old wine and new bottles, were in common use in a secular connection, and have been given a religious stamp. The first aim was to make a collection of edifying sayings for teaching purposes. Only later were they ascribed to Jesus. If he used them, they were not characteristic, and can be paralleled in the Rabbis.* Some are valuable, but Bultmann, Professor of Theology at Giessen, allows himself to describe them as "filled now with a sober, popular morality, now with naïve egoism" (p. 62). Just as the Apocalypse of Mark xiii. is already existing material ascribed to Jesus, so various prophetic utterances were treated.† Much was collected from all quarters and put into the mouth of the Ascended Christ, speaking to the Church. That is, what is generally conceded as a possible explanation of parts of the Fourth Gospel is demanded for the first three. The last stage is the Sermon on the Mount, which is a Catechism.

In the course of a very long and tedious book Bultmann discredits most of our Lord's sayings. Either he can show how they arose, or the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* have a more original version, or Jewish parallels can be traced, or an application to circumstances of the early Church pointed out. Each argument by itself may be plausible: the whole is sufficiently refuted by a *quod est absurdum*.

The miracle-stories are of literary origin. The Old Testament has contributed little. A very elaborate list of parallels and analogies is printed, which illustrate the atmosphere which made possible the pressing in of popular tales.

Bultmann's conclusion is as follows. A collection of sayings was made at a very early period in the Palestinian Church, the favourite literary form, that of Proverbs, being employed. Jesus appears in them as a teacher of "wisdom" and eschatology. In Q, a later stage of this primitive tradition, miracle-stories are practically absent. Mark, on the contrary, gives us a divine man walking on earth. His stories are Hellenistic in origin. There was nothing resembling a "gospel" in his sources. A Christ-myth was needed, so he took over various cult-legends which had already been incorporated in the tradition, and fitted some of the Logia into them. Many parallels can be found, for great characters have a power of attracting floating material to themselves. Thus in parts of rural Germany popular old-world legends are told of Bismarck.

13. The two books just discussed are typical examples of the new school of German Synoptic criticism, which seems little known here. Fortunately, a full monograph has recently been published, E. Fascher's *Die formgeschichtlich Methode*.‡ The long discussions about terminology are so arid that readers may welcome a brief explanation. Wendling and

* Strack-Billerbeck's immense collection of material disposes of this contention.

† But Matt. xxiii. is excluded, being obviously genuine!

‡ Giessen, 1924.

von Soden (and Herder long ago) pointed the way, but only recently have scholars explored it. The purpose of the method is "to investigate the oral tradition of the matter fixed in literary form in the Synoptic Gospels." It has been fully tested in the field of folklore. As regards the New Testament, it applies to the Synoptic Gospels only. During their pre-literary stage all the essential features of folklore are to be found. *Literaturgeschichte* being plainly inappropriate, *Formgeschichte* is coined.

The most important books besides Schmidt's and Bultmann's are Dibelius' *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums* (1919), Albertz' *Die synoptischen Streitgespräche* (1921), and Bertram's *Die Leidensgeschichte Jesu und der Christuskult: Eine formgeschichliche Untersuchung* (1922)*. Dibelius defines his quest as that of "little literary units." Each section has a separate history, which can be traced by criticism. In one part of the Gospels we have deposited the primitive preaching. This can be divided into (*a*) "paradigms," stock tales and illustrations of the preacher (for example, Mk. ii. 1 *f.*, ii. 18 *f.*, etc.), (*b*) proofs from Scripture, (*c*) exhortations to repentance, (*d*) descriptions produced to satisfy the special interest in the Passion and Easter. We must distinguish between these stories told for their own sake as homiletical material and those which merely enshrine a saying. The "Novelle" and "Wundergeschichten" are a different literary form, and have no religious value to speak of.

Albertz specializes on the controversial arguments in the Synoptists, Bertram on the Passion-history. Tradition, he considers, was formed by the needs of the worshipping community. By cult he understands "the inner relation of the faithful to their cult-hero."

Fascher sums up the results so far. Certain types of "form" have been discovered—controversy, miracle-tale, sayings, etc.—and illustrated from Hellenistic and Rabbinic literature. These "forms" were immensely important in antiquity. The man who tells sayings in a gnomic form will change instinctively to a flowing style when he comes to a "wonder-tale." *When the form conflicts with historical accuracy, the form wins.* This is, I think, the gist of the theory.

As regards source-criticism: The main division is not between Q and Mark, but between story-material and sayings-material. But each section is a separate source. Q contains both Palestinian and Hellenistic material. No one author is responsible for it; it appears in very different guise in Matthew and Luke. Q is a convenient term for certain strata of the tradition. It developed before and after Mark; also between Luke and Matthew. As Dibelius puts it, "Q ist keine Schrift, sondern eine Schicht."

Clearly Synoptic criticism has struck its tents and is on the march once more. It is annoying to be obliged to reconsider the two-document hypothesis just when it has got into the textbooks, but Canon Streeter from one side, the post-war Germans from another, have shaken it seriously. The *formgeschichtlich* method has come to stay. In Schmidt's hands it produces relatively conservative results, Bultmann is Strauss *redivivus*. We need not take Bultmann very seriously. One cannot distinguish between Jewish and Hellenistic elements in the way he does. And any theory which makes the early Church greater than Jesus—for this is the effect of his book—is self-condemned. The wonderful words of the Gospel, which still go forth on their campaign of conquest throughout the

* I owe my knowledge of these three to the full analysis of them in Fascher.

world, cannot be the distillation by the early Church of Rabbinic and Hellenistic gnomic sayings and popular tales.

Nor need we be frightened of the word "folklore." Presumably it describes the mind-movements of non-literary humanity, instinctive rather than reflective. That the early Christians valued edification rather than history, that with unerring instinct they shaped the tradition in such a way as best to rouse the sluggish minds of ordinary folk and train their souls for heaven—this we have known for a long while. In this sense we can grant that the principles of folklore may well be applied to the pre-literary stage of Synoptic tradition. Again, that the Gospels are rather preachers' and catechists' manuals than history books will readily be granted. But we believe that the Holy Spirit of Truth brooded over both literary and non-literary stages in the building of the New Testament, and that He controlled the instinctive movements of plain men's minds during the swift successive stages of that mighty Revolution which was accomplished as the disciples thought out the implications of the Life, Death, and Resurrection of Jesus.

The one certain result, to my mind, of this recent work is that a chronological Life of Christ, tracing His mental development from Baptism to the Cross, has become impossible. The very best Lives are now obsolete. The odds against Dr. Cadman's reconstruction, for example, being right are very heavy. If I am justified in my conclusion, I am sure many scholars will breathe a sigh of relief on finding themselves absolved from a burdensome and thankless task.

W. K. L. Clarke.

REVIEWS

MEDIÆVAL DEVOTION*

This is the second volume of the author's work. It begins with the Benedictine School, devotes a lengthy chapter to the spiritual teaching of St. Bernard of Clairvaux, and another to the Benedictine School after Bernard's time. Then follows an account of speculative spirituality and Platonism in the twelfth century, especially in the Abbey of St. Victor at Paris. Also a chapter on speculative spirituality and Aristotelianism, meaning, of course, the teaching of St. Thomas. To these are added discussions on Franciscans, Dominicans, and German mystics, and other schools down to the sixteenth century. A scheme so comprehensive cannot be adequately criticized in the space at our disposal. It is a learned work, the product of much reading. We must confess to feeling that it is rather overweighted at times by the quantity of detailed references. A selection would have been more effective. The type is small, and the pages crowded, for a volume of this size.

The spiritual teaching of St. Bernard naturally occupies the central place. A very careful study has been made of St. Bernard's teaching on humility, and especially of his devotion to the events of our Lord's earthly life, which "gave a new direction to piety. Henceforth the thoughts of faithful religious became occupied with meditation on the principal events of the earthly life of the Saviour. When devotion to the Rosary was fostered, it was only necessary to make use of the method of St. Bernard to honour the joyful, sorrowful, and glorious mysteries of the Christian religion." As might be expected the author has very much to say on Bernard's devotion to the Blessed Virgin, which was "proverbial in the Middle Ages," so that Bernard was called "the singer of Mary," and Dante "chose St. Bernard to guide him near to the throne of Mary in Heaven." After quoting the celebrated titles which Bernard ascribes to her, the author asks, "Why did he think it necessary to refuse to believe in the Immaculate Conception?" For answer, "The perfect good faith of St. Bernard is self-evident, but his error is, nevertheless, a cloud which casts a slight shadow on the reputation of this great servant of Mary." The sentences which follow ought not to be omitted. "There is a pretty legend which, after his death, became current in the monasteries. At Clairvaux, St. Bernard appeared one night to a very holy lay-

* *Mediæval Devotion: Christian Spirituality in the Middle Ages.* By the Rev. P. Pourrat, Supérieur du Grand Séminaire de Lyon. Translated by S. P. Jacques. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 10s. 6d.

brother in his sleep. He was clothed in brilliant whiteness, but with a black stain on his breast. The monk, very surprised and filled with sadness, said to him, 'Father, what is it that I see? A black stain upon thee?' 'It is,' he answered, 'because I wrote concerning the conception of our Lady, as I should not have written, that I bear thus a stain upon my breast, in token of my expiation.'" We imagine that some would select another epithet for this legend than "pretty." But it certainly reveals whole volumes of mediæval mentality.

And yet St. Bernard, in spite of this black mark, had exalted the privileges of Mary to an exceedingly lofty height. Here is what our author says of Bernard's teaching: "Mary is the mediatrix between Jesus and us, between the Saviour and His Christ. Christ is doubtless the great Mediator between God and man. But we are, perhaps, afraid to go to Him, for although He is man, He is also God, and His humanity is somewhat absorbed by the brightness of His divinity. He is good and merciful, but He has been appointed by His Father to judge the world, and in Him the severity of the Judge veils the clemency of the Saviour. It is not the same with Mary, who did not receive the empire of justice, but only that of goodness, gentleness, and mercy. Why, then, should frail humanity fear to have recourse to Mary? There is nothing severe, nothing terrible in her. She is all good, offering to all milk and wool." Therefore "Have recourse to Mary, my dear children, she is the ladder of sinners."

Here, then, is the basis of the theory subsequently worked up into the startling account of the sinner repelled by Jesus, and admitted into Heaven by Mary. It is teaching of this kind which led a Roman Catholic priest, Carson, in his *Reunion Essays*, to say, "This unchristian and untheological notion of Mary's maternity as a prerogative *peculiar* to her—one unpossessed by Father, Son, and Holy Ghost (although as Mother of God she is our Mother too—given to us by Jesus from the Cross)—is at the root of a great deal of the non-Catholic prejudice against the true devotion to Mary sanctioned by the Church. We shall therefore be doing a service alike to Catholicism and the lawful *cultus* of the Mother of God by pointing out, from an analysis of the conception, how opposed it is, not merely to right theology, but to Christianity and even to simple Deism. For what does this distorted notion imply? Plainly, the elevation of a creature to a position superior to that occupied by the God of Unitarianism or of the Catholic Creeds. Mary is made out to be a goddess of love, compassion, tenderness, and sympathy. In her a woman's virtues are idealized, a woman's weaknesses and imperfections absent. She is considered to have

attributes to which God is a stranger; she is more tender than the Saviour—more womanly than the Creator. She is, in one word, *a mother*, and that places her on a plane of a higher order than the humanity of Christ, or even the eternal Fatherhood of God."

Carson points out that what he calls "this false view of Mary's position" conflicts with the fundamental truth that God "contains within Himself the perfections of all His creatures" in an immeasurably exalted and transcendent degree. If the perfections associated with Fatherhood are fully found in God, so also mercy, long-suffering, compassion, pity, tenderness, and love, the attributes of Motherhood, are in their full perfection no less existent in Him. "To suppose that any creature can be richer in the possession of goodness than the Creator is to forget that God is the inexhaustible source of every perfection" (pp. 177-181).

No apology is required for introducing these critical quotations into a review of a book on Christian spirituality. For Fr. Pourrat's treatment of the subject is not purely historical and objective. He says, for example, "it must doubtless have cost St. Bernard a great deal to have to refuse to our Lady the privilege of the Immaculate Conception, for he said that our thoughts and our words, however high they may be, are powerless worthily to express her prerogatives" (p. 54). And, further, the author adds that, "In conformity with the teaching and tradition of the Catholic Church, St. Bernard connects all the spiritual gifts with which the soul of Mary was endowed with the divine maternity." Then follow the illustrations of Mary as the refuge of sinners who are afraid to go to Christ. Is this doctrine in conformity with the teaching of the Catholic Church? Has it officially endorsed these theories concerning our Lord's Mother? Anglicans, at any rate, will remember Pusey's comment: "Christ did not say, Go to my Mother, but Come unto Me."

The closing chapter on the special devotions which arose in the Middle Ages must not be left unnoticed, for it has practical bearings on the religious developments of to-day. Attention is called (1) to mediæval devotion to the Passion of Christ, and to the sorrows of His Mother. "Confraternities were formed in the fifteenth century under the patronage of the five wounds of Christ." As a substitute for pilgrimages to the Holy Land the devotions of the Way of the Cross became popularized. "The present arrangement of the Stations" of the Cross "was definitely fixed in the sixteenth century." (2) Devotion to the Blessed Sacrament was fostered by "exposition of the Blessed Sacrament in transparent monstrances," and by the institution of the Feast of Corpus Christi. (3) The *cultus* of St. Joseph. In the twelfth century St. Joseph "was not as yet the object of

any devotion." It was encouraged by St. Bernard. Peter D'Ailly was "the first who wrote a theological treatise on devotion to St. Joseph," and demanded that a feast should be kept in his honour. Gerson followed. "The pious Chancellor was not content to proclaim the glorious privileges of St. Joseph, and to extol his virtues. He demanded that a feast should be kept in his honour." "Gerson's grief was more particularly touched by the most holy marriage which united Joseph to the Virgin, and, according to him, was the foundation of all his greatness."

Fr. Pourrat's opinion is that this existence of mediæval devotion was due to a period of youth and intense vitality, which was not subjected to regulations. Novelty was not suspected.

These extracts will be sufficient to show the general character of the work.

W. J. Sparrow Simpson.

HISTORY AND CIVILIZATION

The Children of the Sun. A study in the Early History of Civilization. By W. J. Perry, M.A., Reader in Comparative Religion in the University of Manchester. Methuen and Co. 1923. Pp. 551. 18s.

Since the late Dr. W. H. R. Rivers delivered his presidential address to the Anthropological Section of the British Association in 1911 the outlook of many scholars towards the early history of civilization has materially altered. Hitherto the aim of the anthropologist was to work out the evolution of customs, institutions, religion and material culture, on the assumption that the workings of the human mind were everywhere similar, and that, given similar conditions, similar customs and culture would originate independently and develop on the same lines. After the original dispersal of mankind large portions of the earth had been cut off from intercourse with others, it was supposed, so that the process of evolution had occurred in them independently. The cultural similarities that exist, sometimes in minute and technical points, in widely separated regions, were explained as due to the uniformity in the constitution of the human mind, while the survival of races in a primitive state of culture, such as the Australians, represented an arrested development, and therefore indicated the condition in which early man lived. Rivers, however, as a result of his work in Oceania with the Percy Sladen Trust Expedition, was led to see that Melanesian society was composed of a blending of cultures, and later he demonstrated that there has been no such isolation of one part of the earth from another as has been assumed by the "evolutionary" school. Navigation, he claimed, has been capable of carrying man to every part of the earth for far longer periods than has been supposed. Moreover, he disputed the theory of the uniformity of mental process as the cause of the similarity of cultures. On his hypothesis civilization became an artificial product due to a complicated series of circumstances, the cultural elements of which originated as a complex in one centre where the local conditions were favourable. During this process of diffusion the original complex frequently split up, useful arts were lost, and degeneration has been more prevalent than evolution.

While Rivers was thinking along these lines at Cambridge, Professor Elliot Smith at Manchester brought to bear upon the newly-formed hypothesis a wealth of technical knowledge concerning the technique of mummification which he had accumulated during the ten years when he occupied the chair of anatomy at Cairo. He was convinced that the evidence provided by mummies from the islands in Torres Straits was so conclusive a proof of Egyptian influence as to leave no doubt as to the certainty of the spread of culture from the Nile Valley to New Guinea and Australia; and in 1915 he formulated a theory that in Egypt originated the germs of the civilization of the whole world. The migrations of early culture were brought about by Egyptians and Phœnicians, chiefly by sea, and the historic voyages of the Polynesians were cited as evidence that immense distances could be covered by primitive navigators. In the same year Mr. W. J. Perry suggested that the motive which led these ancient mariners on their wanderings was the search for gold, pearls, and other substances which had some definite economic or magical value.

This revolutionary hypothesis, involving as it does the transformation of ethnological enquiry, is set forth in detail in *The Children of the Sun*—a book that doubtless will be regarded as the *locus classicus* of the historical school of anthropologists. Perry terms the original culture-complex the "Archaic Civilization," and regards it as based upon agriculture (which he thinks was the outcome of the discovery of irrigation), and the cult of the dead. Its principal characteristics include the building of pyramids, the mummification of rulers and their descent from the Sun, the dual organization of society, the use of megalithic monuments, irrigation, terraced cultivation, pottery, metallurgy, and polished stone axes. This civilization is so uniform that he thinks it must have had a single origin, and this he traces to Egypt, where at the beginning of the VIth Dynasty all the elements were historically connected owing to a combination of natural and religious circumstances. As the "Children of the Sun," or ruling class, went forth in small bands to seek an "earthly paradise," and for "givers of life" (*i.e.*, the elixir of life—*e.g.*, gold, pearls, etc.), they carried with them the archaic civilization. Thus it penetrated throughout Western Europe and Asia to the Pacific and the New World. Moreover, unhappily in its trail came organized warfare for the first time.

A theme of such magnitude as this, calculated as it is to change entirely our outlook on the origin and development of civilization, requires a group of specialists to examine the evidence in detail from each area. Few anthropologists or students of prehistoric archæology, for example, will agree that "prior to the coming of this civilization, the native peoples were devoid of any magical or religious practices or ideas" (p. 480), since we know that from the Mousterian phase of the Palæolithic period a clearly defined cult of the dead existed in Western Europe, and, as Mr. Perry himself allows in his later work, *The Origin of Magic and Religion* (p. 16 *ff.*), the conception of the Great Mother existed in the "food-gathering days of the Palæolithic Age." Again, many who accept the "historical" view of the origin of culture, will think that he undervalues the geographical, climatic, economic, and political influences in the spreading of civilizations. The common origin of such a practice as agriculture or irrigation will be questioned. Egyptologists may not readily see the connection between Hathor and the Mother Goddess; and archæologists will certainly find it difficult to believe that the valley of the Nile was the original home of the polished stone axe. It is even conceivable that the Americanists, ever

zealous for the independent origin of their culture, may put forth the hypothetical argument that further research will reveal the gradual development of the Maya civilization just as in Babylonia a Sumerian civilization has been found preceding the first Semitic kingdom founded by Sargon; or, in the Ægean, the Minoan civilization of Crete lies behind the Mycenæan; or the predynastic prepares the way for the Old Kingdom in Egypt. But these are technical matters outside the scope of a theological journal.

To the theologian Mr. Perry's work is important, inasmuch as he calls attention to degeneration as a prime factor in the advance of civilization. "The idea of universal, steady, continual, upward cultural progress must be given up, once and for all, as contrary to patent facts; and it must be recognized that civilization is an artificial product which can only thrive in certain soils, and is apt to wither or die in fresh surroundings. Far from low culture meaning primitiveness in time, it would seem invariably, putting on one side the food-gatherers, to mean degeneration" (p. 128). Hitherto the anthropological outlook has been frankly evolutionary. Thus we find Frazer assuming strata in the history of magic and religion as clearly defined as those exhibited by the geological record of the earth—a fundamental error that is partly responsible for the confusion that exists in certain quarters, both as regards the relation of magic to religion and of magic to sacraments. No progress will be made in this direction till scholars rid themselves of the idea that everything has an evolutionary history, and that every practice with which they do not happen to agree must necessarily be a survival from an "age of magic." The time has come for it to be clearly stated that anthropology itself shows that the Darwinian theory is not applicable to the facts of social and religious experience. There is no innate tendency in Man to be progressive, and as early as the Cave period degeneration manifested itself, Neanderthal Man being inferior in cranial formation to his predecessor at Piltdown.

Unfortunately, however, we know nothing at present about religion earlier than the middle of the Palæolithic. Mr. Perry would not accept Otto's contention that a notion akin to the idea of God as a "transcendent Something, a real operative entity of a numinous kind" arose at a very early period, since he regards gods as deified kings (of whom Osiris is the prototype), and primitive man as concerned only with the practical problems of securing food and vitality. "Ideas," he says, "originate not in speculation, but in facts." Nevertheless, he has shown that evolution is not a steady upward process from very simple beginnings, but rather a series of cultural "lifts" followed by degeneration. Thus by reversing the evolutionary process, he has called attention to an important aspect both in religion and civilization, and one that the theologian might with advantage bear in mind.

It would be interesting to apply Mr. Perry's hypothesis to Hebrew culture especially in view of the constant intercourse between Palestine and Egypt from the VIth Dynasty onwards, Nilotic vessels trading to Lebanon even as early as 3000 B.C. Israel was essentially an "underworld people" (*i.e.*, they went to sheol), but they recognized a "sky God" to Whose abode at least one ruler (Elijah) returned. Perhaps Mr. Perry will one day give us a book on the anthropology of the Old Testament in the light of his researches.

If it can be proved that the intellectual progress of the world in general

has been brought about by the radiation in all directions of discoveries and inventions, as well as ideas and beliefs, each of which originated in one definite locality, the position of Israel as "the sacred school of the knowledge of God and of the spiritual life of mankind" will be more understandable. If civilization began in one place there is no reason why a higher type of religion like ethical monotheism or Christianity should not commence also in a given locality. *The Children of the Sun*, in short, is a notable book, and though by some it may appear as the work of an iconoclast, it unquestionably calls attention to a line of thought and a series of facts that theologians, as well as anthropologists and archæologists, will have to take into account.

E. O. James.

The Art of Contemplation. Translated from the Catalan of Ramón Lull, with an introductory essay by E. Allison Peers, M.A., Gilmour Professor of Spanish in the University of Liverpool. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

I begin this review in Ramón Lull's own island, Mallorca, with the Randa facing me—the mountain where stood the "friar's" cell in which he wrote most, if not the whole, of his sacred *roman à tiroirs*, *Blanquerna*, of which the *Book of the Lover and the Beloved*, already noticed in Theology, and the *Art of Contemplation* form parts. It is, however, possible—Professor Peers does not mention the point—that the *Art of Contemplation* was written independently and then inserted by Lull into *Blanquerna*, and part of it may have been composed, or the whole revised, at his missionary College at Miramar. The critical text of the *Comissió Editora Lulliana* (Palma de Mallorca, 1914) has been used, but Professor Peers corrects a few erroneous readings of this text. He will have to make similar corrections when he carries out his promise of Englishing the whole of *Blanquerna;* and, strictly speaking, both the *Book of the Lover and the Beloved* as well as the *Art of Contemplation* require the background of the complete *Blanquerna* for their full comprehension and "intimidad" or inwardness. Is the Professor quite right in saying that "no reliable version (of the *Art of Contemplation*) is accessible in any language"? I may be mistaken, but—to take one example—did not J. Bonlabii publish at Valencia in 1521 a translation of the *Art of Contemplation* in Spanish, or rather Valencian, *i.e.*, a softer dialect than Catalan and containing more Arabic words?

To turn to the book itself and its relation to the *Book of the Lover and the Beloved*. The *Art of Contemplation* is a guide to contemplation and mental prayer, while the *Book of the Lover and the Beloved* is a *cri de cœur*, a "human document," the romance and *journal intime* of a soul's adventure. The word "Art" is to be taken not so much in our sense as in that of Lull's *Arte General* or *Magna—i.e.*, method, scientific demonstration; and great mathematician as he was, the shadow of Ramón's fondness for Arabic "numerosity," mysterious circles and triangles, schematic tables and mathematical formulæ falls upon its pages. Eloquent and passionate at times—with the eloquence and passion of spontaneous love—his *Contemplation* is a medley of philosophy, dialectics, didactics, devotion and science—as Lull understands science in his *Arte General*, and almost as his *epigonos* Luis de Granada understands science in his *Simbolo de la Fé*. Only the burning love of the man saves some of its pages from becoming mere mechanisms and intellectualisms, and as we read this book and some of his other works the figure of another geometrician, who was also to

become in the end the " Fool of God," rises before our eyes—Pascal with his cry, " God, not of philosophers and savants, but God of *Jesus Christ.*" Not that Ramón has anything of the gloom of Port-Royal, but he may be called the Pascal as well as the *jongleur* and *segrel* of Spanish mysticism and Franciscanism.

Professor Peers urges the originality of Lull's *Art of Contemplation*, and speaks of his " voluntarism." But here—it may be submitted—there is room for discrimination. Hardly ever has Catalan, and never has Mallorquin, produced a finer stylist than in some passages of the *Art*, and perhaps nowhere else has Lull so captured the beauty of Arabic rhythm—unfortunately lost in an English translation. Moreover, whatever date be assigned to the *Art of Contemplation*, it could not but show signs of Lull's battle with Averroism and his assimilation of Arabic philosophy, though Ribeira overstates his indebtedness to Muhyi Al-Din ibn al-Arabi—to take but one name—and to the *Kabbala*, albeit Lull, as he himself states in his *De auditu Kabbalistico*, had the highest admiration for what he calls the *superabundans sapientia*, the mystic doctrine of Jewish philosophy. Original, then, his *Art of Contemplation* is in respect of style, rhythm and his philosophy and " logical machine," both of which are a kind of theosophy, or rather semi-rationalistic mysticism, constructed on the principle that not only are ideas representations of realities, but the combinations of ideas are representations of truth existing in real things; and, after all, Lull was a man of genius, though his theory of knowledge and his " ladder " of attributes can be paralleled in Muslim and even Eastern Christian mystics. But neither the ascetics nor the psychology of the *Art* are out of the common. The normal *via purgativa* is here—detachment, mortification, introversion, extroversion, extraspection, the love of one's neighbour, the duty of good works—like all true mystics Lull is practical—with here and there perhaps a hint of Roger Bacon's doctrine of " interior illumination." Ramón knew Roger in Paris. Professor Peers sees originality in the fact that Ramón personalizes the faculties Memory, Will, Understanding, and makes them address one another. But this device, this duologue or *causerie à trois*, is not uncommon in Eastern writers—and Ramón knew his Easterns—and may be a reminiscence of the passages on Memory, etc., in St. Augustine's *Confessions*. Moreover, this device was spreading in the Europe of Ramón's day—*e.g.*, Hugh of St. Victor's (1096-1141) *De arrha animæ*, H. of Langenstein's (1340 ?-1397) *Speculum animæ*.

The fact is that Lull's sources and alleged voluntarism need examination. Of these sources Professor Peers says little. Perhaps he reserves their consideration for his complete edition of *Blanquerna*. Clearly—apart from Jews and Arabs—Augustine, Scotus, Roger Bacon, Avicebrol (who exercised a strong influence upon Duns Scotus), William of Auvergne and others must have a place here, together with the native element or genius that distinguishes the Catalan of the Balearic Isles from the Catalan, say, of Barcelona and Valencia. I say " alleged " voluntarism, for though Lull's theory of the Will reminds one of the Bishop of Manchester's will-philosophy in his *Christus Veritas*, Lull is neither a Will nor a Value philosopher. No doubt he *does* stress the Will. He had no alternative in his fight with Islam. The extreme intellectualism of the Arabians, and notably Averroës, excluded the faculty of Will from the Supreme Being, because they held that Aristotle's theory of the Will or *proairesis*—in point of fact, Aristotle never examined the Will-problem very thoroughly—taught that every act of the Will implies a want, a state of imperfection

and dependence. But if voluntarism be defined as *conation*, Lull does not teach that the Will is that conative organization of which Willing is the *causa essendi* or end-state. Nor, great missionary as he was, is his mysticism the mysticism of that "energy" or "exaltation of action" which Ganivet and others hold to be the special characteristic of Peninsular mysticism—Castilian, Catalan, Portuguese. His is not the primacy of the Will in the ordinary sense of the primacy of the Will *versus* the Intellect. This becomes clearer when we bear in mind that the Catalan or Mallorquin word used by Lull for Will means also Love; that, like most mystics, he employs Intellect and Understanding interchangeably; and that he writes " sicut voluntas non potest amare objectum primum sine charitate, sic intellectus non potest intelligere primum objectum sine fide." It may, therefore, be submitted that Bernhart is right when, in his recent work on the philosophical mysticism of the Middle Ages, he calls Lull the forerunner of the Castilian mystics and the " intellectual love" of St. Teresa. In point of fact, there are passages in Hernando de Zárete and Pedro Malón de Chaide which might have been written by Lull, though Malón is more Neo-platonic than Ramón; and from this point of view it is not quite clear why Professor Peers excludes Ramón Lull from his other book, *Spanish Mysticism* (Methuen, 1924). Probst and Keicher do him more justice.

But if the *Art of Contemplation* is more " intellectual " than the *Book of the Lover and the Beloved*, this is an additional reason why it should be read and studied devotionally. It is quite time that the mysticism of " purple patches " and namby-pambiness was nailed down in its coffin. Neither Plato, indeed, nor the investigation of Sources can give us the soul's relation to the Christian God, but, as, *e.g.*, Baruzi has shown in his recent work on St. John of the Cross, the criticism of Sources helps us to disengage the true mysticism from the false. Menéndez y Pelayo died dreaming of a *History of Spanish Mysticism*. He may—with most Castilians—have called Lull a " heterodox," but he would have welcomed the revived study—one might almost say the approaching rehabilitation—of Ramón Lull, and to this end it is probable that the new school of ascetical and mystical theology with its recent Congress at Valladolid will contribute.

ABBOT OF PERSHORE.

NOTICES

THE MASTER AND HIS BOYS. By S. S. Harris. Warren and Son. 3s. 6d.

This little book represents an interesting attempt by the headmaster of St. Ronan's Preparatory School, Worthing, to set forth the faith that is in him about his profession, with special reference to what he regards as the true relationship between master and boys. It deals with such topics as Religion, School-boy Honour, Swearing, Games, Parents, and is always fresh and interesting. The two most notable characteristics of the writer are his enthusiasm and his sincerity, and no reader of the book will doubt that Mr. Harris has found his vocation as a schoolmaster. He is a keen champion of the Boarding School system. " I have the strongest conviction," he says, " that the passing-away of Preparatory and Public Boarding schools would mark the beginning of a moral, physical and religious deterioration in the country at large "; and this in spite of the

fact that he himself, though very happy as a day-boy at his Public School, looks back with no pleasure to his time as a boarder at a Preparatory School.

The book is permeated throughout with the conviction that the purpose of life is the training of character and that the English Boarding School system gives the best opportunity for this. With a master such as Mr. Harris, this view may have everything to commend it; but a critic may be allowed to wonder whether with the best will in the world many men are able to give themselves up to their calling as whole-heartedly as he obviously does, and also whether the book gives sufficient place to those interests and activities in life which have no immediate reference to moral and spiritual growth. Probably Mr. Harris would reply that at the preparatory school stage the essential thing is to lay a foundation on this rock, leaving other interests to develop spontaneously later; and in this view he may quite possibly be right. In any case, if the leading Preparatory Schools of this country are conducted generally along the lines laid down in this book, the outlook for the future of education in its early stages is extremely bright. We hope that Mr. Harris's book will find many readers, and his example many followers.

R. H. LIGHTFOOT.

The title chosen for the Hulsean Lectures for 1920-21 (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 10s. 6d.), *Knowledge and Virtue*, suggests some subtle treatment of the Socratic identification of these two, but a perusal of Fr. Waggett's work takes us far from a merely academic discussion and introduces us into a real world, war-weary and disillusioned, to which the Hulsean lecturer addresses a powerful appeal, to find in religious knowledge, rightly interpreted, the true remedy for weaknesses which still hinder the vigorous prosecution of peace. Our author's own experiences during the six years 1914-20 enabled him to see a good deal of what can be done by violence of different kinds, and something of what can be done only by persuasion, conviction, and illumination, and the other processes which we think of as more especially of the mind. Hence he seeks first through a University pulpit and now the written page to add his voice, as he says, to the happily growing chorus of voices raised on behalf of thought and against force.

In *The Fundamental Ends of Life* (Macmillan. 6s.), Dr. Rufus M. Jones seeks to open our eyes to the hidden resources of the Interior Life, and he is convinced that the one thing we need to-day in the effort to rebuild the world is to reconstruct our own inner spirits. It is instructive and thought-provoking to turn from Fr. Waggett's solution to that of a writer so far removed from him. If the Quaker mystic seeks to open our eyes to the Spiritual Source of Life and to those deeper forces that can heal us of our grievous wounds, the Catholic knows that such a quest finds its consummation and fruition in that fountain source of spiritual grace, the Real Presence of Christ Himself, made known to us in the Breaking of the Bread.

If preaching could save us, then the perusal of Mr. A. J. Gossip's moving appeals, in the latest addition to the well-known "Scholar as Preacher" series (T. and T. Clark. 7s.) under the title *From the Edge of the Crowd*, ought to lead to something in the nature of a revival. Will it? Perhaps the saddest of all the things which can be said of this age is that the solution of a world's ills was revealed to it and it sinned against the Light. Unlike

Jerusalem of old, which knew not the things pertaining unto its peace, our modern world knows, and knowing, quite definitely rejects them. Here we have in three works, taken almost at random, a wealth of spiritual insight and clarity of vision, which, if accepted and followed out in all its implications, would lift us at once out of our state of spiritual stagnation and bring about a new era. We have a Hulsean Lecturer, employing his great intellectual gifts and spiritual experience in the quest after a solution of our present distress. We have the clear and convincing analysis of our need outlined for us by Dr. Rufus Jones, who is a recognized master of the Interior Life, and we have in Mr. Gossip a man wholeheartedly convinced of the evangelical message of "Good News," and appealing through the written page to the souls of men in a way which almost compels acceptance and surrender to the obedience of Christ. Well may this modern world then ask itself "What lack I yet?" And the answer is certainly not spiritual guidance, direction, illumination. The world to-day possesses these things in abundant measure. If it perishes, it will do so not blindly this time but with open eyes sinning against the Light.

H. M. RELTON.

BOOK NOTES

The Word and the Work. By G. A. Studdert Kennedy. Longmans. 2s. 6d. At the request of the Bishop of London the author has provided a book intended especially for Lenten use, and has given to it the form of a free exposition of the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel. Downright and vigorous in thought and phrasing, it will scarcely be found to yield the sort of reading that is commonly known as "devotional": but it is likely to assist to the author's own strong faith many of those who still bear the wounds of war in their souls, and that is a work to be thankful for. *The Preaching of Jesus.* By G. L. Richardson. Mowbrays. 2s. 6d. Nine studies of our Lord as preacher are here presented, not only for the instruction of those who are called to preach in His Name, but for the edification of all who desire to know more of His spirit and method. Each study consists of four divisions: a subject, an illustration taken from the Gospels, present-day application, and suggestions for meditation. The plan is fresh and interesting, and will serve to win new attention to familiar words. *What Jesus Read.* By T. Walker, D.D. Allen and Unwin. 4s. 6d. In a recent work the author treated with much learning the subject of The Teaching of Jesus and the Jewish Teaching of His Age. He now presents the same subject more popularly in a valuable little book which deals with The Reading of Jesus, The Dependence of Jesus, and The Independence of Jesus. The problem of the divine consciousness of our Lord does not come into view in the book, which is to be accepted simply as a study of His knowledge of contemporary Jewish life and teaching, the extent of His dependence upon it, and the degree of His departure from it. Regarded in this light the book is to be welcomed as a careful statement resting upon a full knowledge of the documents. *The Revelation of God.* By W. J. Sparrow Simpson, D.D. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d. This volume of sermons is the second in a new series recently initiated by the publishers, and contains a good and varied selection of the author's teaching delivered in various pulpits. Perhaps the most striking thing about these sermons is the demonstration they afford that, in the hands of a scholar accustomed to arrange his thoughts in logical order and to prune

his words, a surprising amount of teaching may be compressed into an address of very moderate length without the infliction of intellectual surfeit upon the hearers. It is a special pleasure to find in the book a sermon preached at Oxford on Vocation to the Ministry, and another on Community Life in the English Church. *The Problem of the Cross.* By V. F. Storr. 2nd edition. S.C.M. 4s. Canon Storr has made considerable changes in this second edition of his book on the Atonement, which was well received on its first appearance in 1919; but his work is unaltered in its main outlines. It is a very honest and helpful attempt to see the problem fairly from all sides, and, if it does not satisfy everyone who reads it, that is only because of the diversity of men and the nature of the subject. The author rightly dissents from those who claim to be able to dispense with any theory of the atonement because they rest in the fact. "Is a bare fact anything at all? Must not every fact be so far interpreted that it is brought into connection with the knowledge already existing in our minds?"

O. H.

Short summaries of recent research do not readily lend themselves to reviews, otherwise the two latest volumes of the Liverpool Diocesan Board of Divinity series would deserve far more than a brief note. Archbishop D'Arcy's lectures on *Science and Creation* (Longmans. 3s. 6d.) and Dr. Matthews' on *The Psychological Approach to Religion* (Longmans. 3s.) deal with very different subjects, but are alike in their wide knowledge and attractive literary style. They deserve to be widely known and bought. *Christ's Revelation of God.* By William Temple, Bishop of Manchester. S.C.M. 1s. 6d. The Bishop's output is amazing. A continual stream of books large and small comes from his pen, nor is there any sign of its becoming shallow. These three lectures, delivered to the Students' Conference at Manchester in January, 1925, are all that one would wish popular theology to be. The Bishop has a wonderful power of summarising accurately and forcibly. Does not his Comment on the Parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard say all that is needed? "It is all wrong in relations between an employer and labourers. But, of course, it is all right in the family." *Gambling and Betting.* By R. H. Charles, D.D. T. and T. Clark. 1s. 6d. The special interest in this new contribution to the literature of gambling is the account of its origin. Primitive man found his zest for play inexplicably departing as his youth passed away; gambling was devised as a means of prolonging the zest. Once the principle had been established, stakes could be applied to other things than games. In fact, nearly the whole of life belonged to the unexplained, that is, to chance. Gambling is essentially an inheritance from savage man, which civilization should outgrow. *Fifty Years.* By William Lawrence, Bishop of Massachusetts. S.C.M. 3s. 6d. This little book is interesting as showing the standpoint of an American bishop who represents the Liberal wing of the Episcopal Church. It contains an introduction from the pen of the Bishop of Birmingham, in which he sketches the recent Modernist controversy in the American Church, describing the Bishops' Pastoral Letter of November 14, 1923, and the reply of the Theological School Professors of Cambridge, Mass.

W. K. L. C.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS, LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER